THE DISCIPLES DIVINITY HOUSE
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

HERBERT LOCKWOOD WILLETT
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
CARLI: Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois

http://www.archive.org/details/christianunionqu19unse

L. XIX. No. 1 JULY, 1929

"God gave unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation"

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

CONTENTS

At the Editor's Desk
  The New York Conference
  Christian Unity to the Front
  Backward Actions
Charles Henry Brent: An Appreciation . . EDWARD L. PARSONS
The Reaction to the Christian Unity Pact . . . FREDERICK LYNCH
The Next Step Toward Christian Unity . . . . . D. J. EVANS
The Significance of Infancy . . . . . EDWIN D. STARBUCK
The Religions of India . . . . HENRY A. ATKINSON
The United Lutheran Church in America as an Intra-Denominational Movement in Church Union . . . . ABDEL ROSS WENTZ
Church Federations . . . . ROSS W. SANDERSON
The Community Church . . . . CLIFF TITUS
The Catholicity of Congregationalism . EDWARD TALLMADGE ROOT
Liberty and Corporate Fellowship: The Keynote of the United Church . . . . . W. ROBINSON
The Order of Antioch . . . . . . FREDERIC E. J. LLOYD
What People and Papers Are Saying About Unity
  The Diocesan Council of Virginia Favor the Reconciliation Pact — Merger of Young People's Societies — The Church of Christ in China — Christian Unity in the Philippines
Letters and Comments
Book Reviews
  If I Could Preach Just Once — Protestantism in the United States — The Dilemma of Protestantism — The Master

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, Inc.
W. H. HOOVER, President
230 N. FULTON AVE., BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.
AGENTS:
Fleming H. Revell Company, New York
Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai

a year 75 cents a copy

BL 1

A Statement

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the Unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are free to all indications of Christian Unity and Ventures of Faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all others who accept Jesus as Lord and Savior — are parts of the Church of Christ and that their Equality before God is the paramount issue of modern times.

Such a journal must, necessarily, be unofficial in its attempt to be an Interpreter of the mind of the churches and in furnishing a Forum for better understanding and cordial appreciation between the divided, and sometimes far isolated, communions of Christendom. It, thereby, seeks to contribute something to clear the way to the Altar of Reconciliation.

It does not hold itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors, except in a very general way as to their character and general attitude; but it invites to its pages such contributions of thought as will, on one hand, help in the removal of misunderstandings, and, on the other, create an atmosphere where our differences may be frankly faced and freely discussed in Christian Fellowship.

All contributors are allowed the same freedom in the expression of their thoughts, as the Editor exercises for himself. He does not anticipate that others will always approve his thoughts, any more than he presumes to assume responsibility for the thoughts of others; but every writer is responsible for what appears above his own name. We are to be free to think and equally free to let think, until, in corporate thinking and corporate praying, we find the Road to Brotherhood.

Consequently, this journal is not only not the organ of any party in Christendom; but, likewise, it is not the exponent of any theory of Christian Unity. It follows the reality in personal experience of spiritual growth in Christ — growing up in Him and toward other Christians as we find the Truth, which shall free us from suspicion, prejudice, pride, and unlove. Then we shall be able to interpret Christ in those terms which He expressed in His own words,—"By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have Love one to another."

1549

CONTENTS

JULY, 1929

Vol. XIX. No. 1.

AT THE EDITOR'S DESK 3
- *THE NEW YORK CONFERENCE* 3
- *CHRISTIAN UNITY TO THE FRONT* 5
- *BACKWARD ACTIONS* 7

CHARLES HENRY BRENT: AN APPRECIATION .... Edward L. Parsons 9

THE REACTION TO THE CHRISTIAN UNITY PACT .... Frederick Lynch 19

THE NEXT STEP TOWARD CHRISTIAN UNITY .... D. J. Evans 26

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF INFANCY .... Edwin D. Starbuck 29

THE RELIGIONS OF INDIA .... Henry A. Atkinson 37

THE UNITED LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA AS AN INTRA-DENOMINATIONL MOVEMENT IN CHURCH UNION .... Abdel Ross Wentz 50

CHURCH FEDERATIONS .... Ross W. Sanderson 59

THE COMMUNITY CHURCH .... Cliff Titus 65

THE CATHOLICITY OF CONGREGATIONALISM .... Edward Tallmadge Root 68

LIBERTY AND CORPORATE FELLOWSHIP: THE KEYNOTE OF THE UNITED CHURCH .... W. Robinson 77

THE ORDER OF ANTIOCH .... Frederic E. J. Lloyd 83

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY 86

LETTERS AND COMMENTS 88

BOOK REVIEWS 92

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY
230 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

Entered as second-class matter October 18th, 1923, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., U.S.A., under the Act of Congress of March 3rd, 1879.

The Christian Union Quarterly

EDITOR

Peter Ainslie, D.D., Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Frederick Lynch, D.D., Educational Secretary Church Peace Union, New York, and Beverley D. Tucker, Jr., D.D., Rector St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, Richmond, Va.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Dr. Hamilcar Alivisatos,
Athens, Greece.
Bishop Charles P. Anderson,
Chicago, Ill.
Rev. Nehemiah Boynton, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.
Bishop Charles H. Brent,
Buffalo, N.Y.
Dean Charles R. Brown,
New Haven, Conn.
Prof. William Adams Brown,
New York, N.Y.
Rev. Raymond Calkins, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass.
Bishop James Cannon, Jr.,
Washington, D.C.
Prof. Dr. J. Eugene Choisy,
Geneva, Switzerland.
Rev. S. D. Chown, D.D.,
Toronto, Canada.
Dr. J. A. Cramer,
Utrecht, Holland.
Prof. Dr. Adolf Deissmann,
Berlin, Germany.
Rev. A. W. Fortune, D.D.,
Lexington, Kentucky.
Dean H. E. W. Fosbroke,
New York, N.Y.
Dean W. E. Garrison,
Chicago, Ill.
Principal Alfred E. Garvie,
London, England.
Most Rev. Metropolitan Germanos,
Thyatira, Asia Minor.
President W. A. Harper,
Elon College, N. C.
Dr. Henry T. Hodgkin,
Shanghai, China.
Rev. Finis S. Idleman, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.
Dean W. R. Inge,
London, England.
Prof. Rufus M. Jones,
Haverford, Pa.
Rev. Samuel McComb, D.D.,
Dresden, Germany.
Bishop Francis J. McConnell,
New York, N. Y.
Bishop William F. McDowell,
Washington, D.C.
Rev. William P. Merrill, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.
Dr. Wilfred Monod,
Paris, France.
Dr. C. C. Morrison,
Chicago, Ill.
Dr. John R. Mott,
New York, N.Y.
Bishop Harald Ostenfeld,
Copenhagen, Denmark.
Bishop Edward L. Parsons,
San Francisco, Calif.
Prof. Arthur S. Peake,
Manchester, England.
President George W. Richards,
Lancaster, Pa.
Principal W. B. Selbie,
Oxford, England.
Pastor Dr. Friedrich Siegmund-Schultze,
Berlin, Germany.
Dr. Robert E. Speer,
New York, N.Y.
The Archbishop of Upsala,
Upsala, Sweden.
Dr. Henry van Dyke,
Princeton, N. J.
Rev. Joseph A. Vance, D.D.,
Detroit, Mich.
Bishop Boyd Vincent,
Cincinnati, Ohio.
The Archbishop of York,
York, England.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

JULY, 1929

AT THE EDITOR'S DESK

The New York Conference

We have been talking about Christian unity for a good while. Too frequently we have been up in the air with a multitude of generalities. The Reconciliation Pact, which appeared in the last issue of *The Christian Union Quarterly,* was an adventure to bring us to the earth to face the facts. Should the churches abandon their divisions for unity? Are we willing to go sympathetically into all Christian unity conferences? Do we recognize that all Christians are equals before God, so that no Christian will be denied membership in our churches, nor a place in our celebration of the Lord's supper, nor other ministers be denied our pulpits because they are not of the same denomination as our own? Are we willing to carry good-will to our brethren of other denominations as we do to our brethren of our own denominations? These are pertinent questions and many are answering them without equivocation.

The interest in the pact has grown so that it has been decided to hold a conference in New York, at St. George's Church, November 13-15, 1929. It is proposed to have a membership in the conference of one thousand persons from as many denominations as will sign the pact. On the first evening, November 13th, there will be a reception for the members of the conference and their friends who may accompany them. It will afford an opportunity for mutual acquaintance in preparation for the conference.

On the evening of November 14th there will be addresses on "Our Common Agreements" and "Shall we Continue our Emphases on Definitions and Methods as Tests of Fellowship Rather than on Purposes and Objectives?" There will be two twenty-five minute addresses on each of these themes, followed by two ten minute addresses on each. The entire afternoon of that day will be devoted to group conferences with twenty-five or thirty persons in a group, so that every person attending the conference will have an opportunity to make a contribution of his thought and spirit on some phase of Christian unity. On the evening of that day there will be two addresses of thirty minutes each on "The Power of the Spirit of Christ in Removing Barriers."

On the 15th there will be two twenty-five minute addresses on "The Evidences of our Growth Toward Unity," and likewise two addresses of the same length on "Our Immediate Possibilities and Practical Adventures" with two ten minute addresses following each theme. In the afternoon the group conferences will make their report to the general conference. The report on findings will emerge from this conference, it is hoped, with the most courageous and practical recommendations that it is possible to make from a group of one thousand persons upon whose heart weigh heavily the needs of a united Christendom. In the evening the Lord's supper will be celebrated in which one thousand conference members and an equal number of visitors will share.

This conference of the Christian Unity League has come spontaneously out of the interest created by the Reconciliation Pact. Only persons who sign the pact can be members of the conference and share in its discussions. Others can attend and there will be accommodation for a thousand or more visitors.

The Reconciliation Pact stands for democracy. Christian unity discussions must be shared with the people. It is a people's problem. A few Christians, however devout and scholarly, cannot settle this problem for all Christians any more than a few can be saved for all. Jesus Christ trusted people. A religion that cannot trust people cannot trust God. The Reconciliation Pact stands for the equality of all Christians before God. To close the church doors or the communion table to other denominations because they do not worship and teach just as we do does not conform to the Spirit of Christ nor the needs of the world. We are all brethren and we fail in our Christian service if we do not discover our brotherhood. "One is your teacher, and you are all brothers." The Reconciliation Pact stands for good-will to all our brethren of all denominations. It is a definite adventure in good-will to all Christians.

The New York conference has before it a large possibility. Let us go to it in prayerful humility and courageous expectation. Christ is alive and the evidence of his church being alive lies in the reality of brotherhood. It is a possible accomplishment of this generation.

Christian Unity to the Front

THE times were never so propitious for the advancement of Christian unity idealism as to-day. There are many Christians in all denominations who are deeply interested in every effort that is made for peace and friendliness among the churches. Letters come to our desk from all parts of the world, revealing an interest that is prophetic.

There has never been a time since the church divided into its multiplicity of divisions that Christians in all the denominations have become so sane regarding the Spirit of Christ and the needs of the world for a united Christendom as now. It is good news material for the front pages of the daily papers. Sometimes it occupies a full column; sometimes several columns. Our denominationalism has wearied the world and every indication of reconciliation is a relief. Christian unity books have sales far beyond what they used to have. People are becoming more and more interested in those things that make for peace in the divided house of Christ. On the other hand, those things that make for the continuance of denominationalism are weakening in the mind of an intelligent world.

In April the Church Federation of Pennsylvania held an important conference on Christian unity in Harrisburg which was largely attended. In June the Christian Herald Institute held a conference on Christian unity at Buck Hills Falls, Pennsylvania, attended by nearly a hundred persons from various parts of the country. They were free and courageous in their thinking. This summer the continuation committees of the World Conference on Faith and Order and the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work will hold important meetings in Europe. There are other meetings on this subject scheduled for the summer, both in America and abroad.

The Presbyterians of Scotland are getting together. The British Methodist Union act, as passed by Parliament, empowers the Wesleyan Methodists, Primitive Methodists, and the Union Methodists to become one body under the name of "the Methodist Church." The Anglican Church of India, the Wesleyan Methodists, and the South India United Church are advancing definitely toward union. Perhaps the Lambeth Conference of 1930 may put a check on Anglicans going into such a union, but that is to be seen. The United Church of Canada, made up of what once were Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists, has passed their fifth anniversary with increasing satisfaction over the consummated union. The American Congregationalists are leading in Christian unity by forming the union of themselves and the Christian Church, making a body in excess of a million persons. Their recent council passed the recommendations unanimously and it is likely that the Christians will do likewise in October, for they have, for a long time, been Christian unity advocates. A merger of equal importance and making a body of about the same size is that of the Reformed Church in the United States, the United Brethren in Christ, and the Evangelical Synod of North America, becoming "the United Church in America." If any hitch occurs in this move it is most likely to come from the United Brethren, where a small minority appears to be hesitating, but it is possible that this can be overcome in the ensuing quadrennium by larger mutual acquaintance and the exercising of patience.

Most of the denominations are talking about Christian unity, some making advances through special commissions, such as the Episcopalians, Methodists and Presbyterians. Some Baptists and some Disciples favor getting together, but there will have to be considerable work in mutual education before their national conventions will vote favorably. The mind of the church is slowly but permanently turning toward a united Christendom. Sectarian protests cannot check it. The Spirit of Christ is finding outlets.

Backward Actions

WHILE many denominations are making advances toward each other in the interest of unity the Western Pennsylvania Disciples are making for the woods. At a recent board meeting, they voted not to receive any more money for missionary work from open membership Disciple churches, regarding all such money, both from unimmersed Christians and immersed Christians who fellowship with the unimmersed Christians, as tainted money. *The Christian-Evangelist,* St. Louis, a Disciple organ of reactionary tendencies, commends this course as "admirable."

Those Disciple churches in that area that practice open membership, especially an outstanding church like that of which Dr. John Ray Ewers is minister, will lose no sleep over such action, for the hope of the Disciples in that territory necessarily rests almost, if not entirely, with the open membership churches whose fellowship is with all other Christians, while the other Disciple churches are satisfied to have fellowship only among themselves. This is a sorry plight for any denomination in these days of Christian unity activity, especially a denomination that had its origin in a desire for a united Christendom.

They cannot think of having fellowship with the Northern Baptists for there are more open membership churches among them, four to one, than among the Disciples. The Southern Baptists do not want them without re-immersion. In being reminded of this, *The Baptist and Reflector,* Nashville, said, "Baptist narrowness in refusing to accept the so called baptism of other denominations is but the 'narrowness' of Jesus who refused to accept the righteousness of the Pharisees." The

Western Pennsylvania Disciples could hardly relish seeking fellowship with that particular type of Baptists who regard themselves as little Jesuses and Disciples as the successors of the Pharisees. If, however, they could have the Southern Baptists to do their immersing it might help out on one hand. But the difficulty there is that the Southern Baptists will not immerse Disciple converts unless they join the Southern Baptist Church. The Dunkards would not accept the Disciples because the Dunkards practice trine immersion. So those Western Pennsylvania Disciples present a study, not enough interest however to make a worthwhile investigation, but to be kindly remembered because that among them once, long time ago, Thomas Campbell sincerely yearned for a united Christendom, the echoes to whose voice they have tried to give burial.

But the problem of tainted money from the unimmersed Christians and the immersed Christians who associate with the unimmersed is still more complicated. The separation of the clean and unclean dimes and dollars will doubtless be the theme of one or more addresses in the forthcoming convention of the Western Pennsylvania Disciples. Speakers may be called from afar. We do not know the place nor the date of this convention, but it will doubtless be centrally located and on a convenient date for a large attendance. This is a great theme for a group of sectarians!

Of course none of these are religious questions at all, either on the part of the Western Pennsylvania Disciples or the Southern Baptists of *The Baptist and Reflector* type. These are purely denominational matters and they are cited here to show how far denominationalism is separated from Christianity. Years ago people used to get vexed over conditions like these because they thought denominationalism was Christianity; but, with growing intelligence and constant repetition of such peculiarities, the whole thing passes into the realm of jokes, while a sober minded world, if it has enough interest in such petty matters, wonders what it is all about.

CHARLES HENRY BRENT: AN APPRECIATION

BY RT. REV. EDWARD L. PARSONS, D.D.

Protestant Episcopal Bishop of California, San Francisco

THERE are many men whose death would have been more generally commented on than that of Bishop Brent. There are few whose death could bring sorrow to a larger circle of devoted friends scattered all over the earth. He was the bishop of a diocese. His immediate responsibilities were concentrated in Western New York. He was quite as much a bishop whose diocese, like Wesley's parish, was the world. The range of his real responsibilities was world-wide for his interests and his friendships were world-wide.

The bald record of his life indicates the extent and variety of his contacts. Born in a Canadian rectory on April 9, 1862, and graduated from Trinity College, Toronto, with honors, in 1884, he began his ministry in Buffalo and began at the same time his notable career as a citizen of the United States. From Buffalo he soon went to Boston to enter the novitiate of the Society of St. John the Evangelist (the Cowley fathers). He never became a member of the society; but it was there first at the church of St. John the Evangelist and later at its offshoot, St. Stephen's, that his distinction as a preacher was recognized. He was at St. Stephen's when in 1901 the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal church elected him to be bishop of the Philippines, a pioneer missionary task. He remained in the Philippines for seventeen years, three times refusing bishoprics in America, twice that of Washington. In 1918 he accepted the election to Western New York and went back to end his ministry in Buffalo where it began. During his missionary period his responsibilities were continually widening. He represented the United

States at the opium conferences of 1909 and 1911. He was called on again in 1924 for that at Geneva. When America went into the war he became senior headquarters chaplain, the highest position in the chaplain corps, and served with great distinction. In 1925 he was one of the outstanding figures at the Stockholm Conference on Life and Work.

In 1927 he was at Lausanne. There he saw realized in the World Conference on Faith and Order his own vision. Most fittingly he was called upon to preside and that presidency was the crown of his life's work. At Lausanne he was in constant physical suffering. On his return to America he spent many months in the hospital, recovered enough to take a little work again, was present at the General Convention of his church in Washington in October, 1928, and immediately thereafter went abroad, carrying with him the official greetings of the Episcopal church to the retiring archbishop of Canterbury and his successor. Illness prostrated him; but in March he seemed well enough to undertake a Mediterranean trip. Stopping at Lausanne on the way, he died there where were gathered the memories of what must have been for him the supreme moment of his career.

The record indicates, as I have said, the extent of his interests. It suggests the extent of his influence. To those who knew him even if they could not claim such intimate friendship as would bring self revelation, it also reveals a characteristic which is the clue to the meaning of all his work. He rejoiced in difficulties. He seemed to choose always the most difficult tasks, and to embark most gladly when it must be upon uncharted seas. The hill of difficulty was a challenge. He was one who daily might have prayed,

God give us hills to climb
And strength to climb them.

It is a sure instinct upon the part of those who have written about him that so often one finds quoted the title of one of his books, "Adventures for God," so often he is described as an adventurer, a pioneer, a prophet. He was. But clearly it was not because he was by nature a soldier of fortune seeking excitement. It was because wherever he went he envisaged the whole task which lay before him — or before the world — and inevitably moved upon those aspects of it which presented its most serious difficulties.

In that he showed that practical sense of reality which so often characterizes the mystics. He dreamed dreams; but he never saw them only as dreams. He saw the facts of life in relation to them, the points of contact, the lines along which advance could be made, the difficulties which stood in the way. His experience as priest, as bishop, as missionary, as chaplain, brings him to one issue after another, one task or problem after another. He never dodges; he never evades, he never makes light of difficulties. There is no superficial optimism. The greater the difficulty, the more inevitably he moves toward it, measuring it well; but sustained by his unshaken faith in the power of God. "I may be a fool," he says, speaking at Stockholm of a warless world and a united church, "I may be a fool, but, if so, I am God's fool."

I do not know what considerations took him at the beginning of his ministry toward the life of a religious order. But it seems almost obvious that he would be attracted to it. The Cowley fathers represented sacrifice, self denial, willing obedience to the call of God. These appealing aims were nourished in a devotional rule which was genuine and spontaneous. It was adventure, difficulty which took him to Boston. It was the same spirit which led him out to a great work among the unprivileged. Perhaps it was the same spirit which led him to draw back from final acceptance of the obligations of the society. The flavor of spiritual adventure might seem to him to have been lost under the protection of safeguarding rules and associations. But his life in Boston at St. John's and St. Stephen's had fixed permanently and happily for him the habit of devotion, the realization of the deep need of God, "the importance of the unseen."

It was from that life that he was called to the Philippines, in those days an unknown world to Americans. It was a pioneering task. It was a task of statesmanship. Work had to be begun but also policies had to be laid down. What was the Episcopal church to do in the islands? Was it there to minister to the Americans who belonged to it? or to the Filipinos who had slipped from obedience to the church of Rome? Or was it there to go out to the savage tribe and the still barbarous Mohammedans in the wilder regions? Characteristically the new bishop, while he did the work which lay at hand, built a cathedral church in Manila, established schools, ministered to the Americans and made approach easy for the unchurched Filipinos, reached out and put his heart into the most difficult task of all. It is among the Igorots and the Moros that the most notable work was done. The neglected savages must be Christianized and civilized. The half civilized Mohammedans must learn what real Christianity — not the Christianity of guns and commercial exploitation — brings to human life.

Here in the Philippines he came in contact on a vast scale with the results of economic exploitation. It was he who first gave impetus to what developed into the American Commission on the opium question and led to the International Conferences of 1909, 1911, and 1924. He was a member of all three and presided in 1911. Such experiences revealed to him more and more clearly the gap between "Christian" civilization and the teaching of Christ. His sympathies turned to plans and projects for socializing industry. I remember hearing him say, what no doubt he said often in public, that the wartime program of the British Labor Party was the finest document of that whole tragic epoch. Again he saw the difficulty inherent in any attempt to change the basis of the industrial order, but that only gave a richer flavor to the task. At Stockholm he said, "A man of affairs shies at the suggestion that the next step for Christians to take is the bold application of the principles by which Jesus Christ lived in his workaday life to the industrial problems of our times." The idea evokes the exclamation, "That would be a declaration of war." Just so. Because the purpose and the way of Jesus Christ are hostile to much that is characteristic of the thought and activity of modern commerce "that would be a declaration of war!" That is to say: here is a task which presents the utmost difficulty; for not only is the problem itself complex and baffling but any attempts to solve it will meet with bitter and violent hostility. It is infinitely hard. Therefore let us go forward.

It was with the same joy that Brent gave himself to the arduous work of the chief chaplaincy in the American Expeditionary Force. He believed with all his heart in the "moral aims" of the war. He wrote the two pastoral letters which the house of bishops of the Episcopal church sent out during the conflict. No one commended with more eloquence what we all believed to be the cause of righteousness nor urged more effectively the responsibility of individual citizens. His international distinction gave him likewise great influence in interpreting America's position, particularly in England. It is the universal testimony that wherever he went, whether as messenger of good-will among the allies, or as minister of Christ among the officers and soldiers at the front, new faith and hope sprang to life and men felt more vividly the presence of God.

But in war, in the midst of its horrors and face to face with its constant negation of all that Christ means for the world, the magnitude and the pressing importance of the task of peace came clearer to him and when he laid aside his uniform it was to become one of the leaders in the peace movement. Many times his friends heard him speak of the change which reflection upon the war system had brought. The tragedies of the peace conference, the revelations of sordid nationalism, America's renunciation of responsibility all contributed to "disillusionment." Thereafter he sought with prayer and meditation to sound to the depths the problem of the Christian's attitude toward war and with pen and voice to stir Christians to rise against it. "The issue is clear," he said, "and the Christian church must face it or imperil the charter given it by Christ." In the field of politics he espoused the institutions which are necessary to substitute a law-governed for a force-governed world, the League, the World Court, conference and arbitration treaties, the pact of Paris. In the field of moral and religious concern he identified himself with international movements such as the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, and never failed when opportunity arose to point out the intimate relation of the unity of the church and the unity of mankind.

And so we come to that great movement in which Brent's leadership has given him, I doubt not, his chief claim upon the future. No sooner had he begun missionary work in the Philippines than his soul was tortured by the weakness which division brought. The scandal of it appalled him. In 1907 at the General Convention of his church he spoke with stirring power. In 1910 he went to Edinburgh to take part in the great Missionary Conference. Coming back to America, again to General Convention, he described the work of evangelizing the world as it had been portrayed at Edinburgh; and then he noted that not only was the whole evangelistic task hampered and often rendered futile by division, but that even such a conference as that just held was possible only because all who attended were willing to keep the real causes of division in the background. He suggested that the next step toward unity was for the Christian churches to get together, take out from hiding these real causes, these doctrines freighted with the memories of bitter controversy and intolerant persecution, and frankly confer about them. He challenged the church to such an enterprise.

Nothing could have been more characteristic. The easy way to approach unity was to evade the controversial matters, to work together on the surface and to hope that somehow men might forget the real difficulties. That was dodging the issue, praying that the path be made level, shading one's eyes so as not to see the hill of difficulty. Such was not Brent's way, but rather to see the hardest part of the problem and go straight at it. His church accepted the challenge. A commission was appointed. Invitations were issued. Conferences were held. The war blocked the way for four years; but immediately thereafter the work began again. A preliminary conference under the presidency of Bishop Brent was held in Geneva in 1920 and a continuation committee appointed which was the instrument through which, in 1927, the Faith and Order Conference itself was brought together. It would be impossible for any one and especially for one who participated but little in the active work of those years to appraise the extent to which Bishop Brent's wisdom, faith, and absolutely unselfish surrender to the great cause contributed to the success of the conference. But it is clear that when by acclamation he was chosen its president there was no doubt in the minds of those representatives of the Christianity of the world that of all men he stood out the chief inspiration, the major prophet, the wisest leader in the most difficult task the church had faced since first it conquered the Roman Empire.

It was not that he had brought it about alone. Many had worked as hard as he and he would surely have counted Robert H. Gardiner as one who had contributed far more to its assembling and, though he were dead, to its success. But Brent did in a very special way symbolize the search for unity and in the bigness of his personality seem more than any other to suggest the meaning of its completion.

The method of conference was also characteristic of his mind. Controversy is easy. Debate is fun. Negotiation is a game. But conference on essential matters tests the bigness of a man's soul to the utmost. Brent believed in it thoroughly. He saw that only on the basis of the mutual trust which conference assumes could truth be reached. Formal conference on any difficult social problem is the attempt to bring into compact and accessible form the methods which in the long process of social evolution are those that count. Therefore it was not only in church unity but in all kinds of ways that he fostered the spirit of conference. He was, almost unknown to the world, one of the leading spirits in that fruitful organization (if it can be called an organization) which beginning as an effort to prepare for a conference on the Christian way of life, has under the name of *The Inquiry* been carrying the conference method into all sorts of interesting and significant problems. Here is what *The Inquiry* says of the bishop:

"Lastly, Bishop Brent's leadership was of such nature that his long absences and his final departure scarcely lessen the influence of his beautiful spirit. Characteristically, the monument which, knowing the seriousness of his illness, he desired to have erected as an expression of his friends' remembrance, is an educational foundation on behalf of a small, almost forgotten people in the hills of Luzon, a foundation which will be missionary in aim — not in the sense of converting those somewhat primitive Mohammedans to a specific Christian creed, but in that of bringing to them the love and fellowship of any and all humble believers in the sanctity of life."

It is worth noting that the last resolution of any importance which he offered in the General Convention of his church asked for the appointment of a commission to confer with similar commissions of the Presbyterian and Methodist churches on Christian morality in relation to organic unity,—another difficult problem in the great cause to which he gave such passionate devotion.

The broadening of interest and responsibility which we have so briefly sketched to its culmination in the Faith and Order Conference went *pari passu* with a broadening of his whole theological and religious outlook. Brent was not a technical theologian. He had some little fear of theologians lest for their very technical excellence they lose sight of the wider realities in God's world of men. He wrote some sixteen or eighteen books, most of them devotional or descriptive of religious experience, one of them a careful biography of the late Bishop Satterlee of Washington; but none of them was for scholars alone. His own theological thinking was nevertheless clear and fully self-conscious. Twice in recent years he has appraised it and marked the change and growth in his outlook: once at the twenty-fifth anniversary of his episcopate and again in a valedictory message to his diocese written shortly before his death from his "extraordinary vantage ground on the borders of the world of eternity." The valedictory is full of the greatness of the experience which has come to him. "My experience of the past twelve months and more," he says, "has shown me that the valley of the shadow of death is a highly illumined valley and is more akin to a mountain top which reveals long views and endless vistas than it is to a place of gloom." Such triumphant faith recalls the manner with which, coming into a committee meeting last fall in Washington, he responded to a passing remark with the words, "Indeed I know now that life is a tragedy," and then in some subtle fashion made one feel that its tragic quality exalted it and made God real.

And what is in the view which he sees from this high valley? There is God incarnate in Jesus Christ. There is the love of God revealed in Jesus Christ. There is Jesus Christ revealed in human life and the church as the Body of Christ. There is the essentially social character of the church if ever the kingdom of God is to be realized among men. Religion is therefore so simple. As Christ summed it up, to love God; to love one's neighbor. And thus it comes to pass that the church of Christ must in ideal be comprehensive, inclusive of all that is genuine in Christian experience. In this valedictory as elsewhere he hints at the change which had come over his thinking from the narrow and exclusive doctrine of his youth to this wide vision, "Now while I recognize the value to me and to many of the sacramental approach which nothing can ever impair so far as I am concerned, I also recognize that there are those to whom all the world is a sacrament and who depend chiefly, sometimes wholly, on the inner approach and the mystical element in religion; whether or no we stress the sacramental, this inner element is indispensable." And the great church which includes both must come, for as he says in the sermon at Lausanne, "God calls man to unity," and elsewhere, "God wills unity."

It was this process of growth in his thinking which made him unclassifiable. He was Anglo-Catholic at the beginning of his ministry. He was Catholic at the end. No school could claim him. He was too Catholic for the Catholics; he was too Protestant for the Protestants. He believed utterly that the church is the Body of Christ. He believed utterly in the glorious liberty of the children of God. But after all the reason his theology was vital was because his religion was real. "It is the withinness that counts," he said. "Man must meet God in the soul and live with God in the world."

Out of this communion with God, this deep devotional experience there grew the fine and substantial character of his life, the life of one who may truly be called a modern saint. He was strong of will, broad in sympathy, patient in achievement. All who have written of him agree in that. None has put into truer words than these of Professor Addison the impression which he made upon those who knew and loved him:

"Gentle he was and humble, pure at heart like a flame, but essentially virile, of a restful and massive calm, wielding power through imparting a sense of immense reserve energy — the latent force of one whose indomitable will was rooted in the divine will. He lived with Christ and now that he has beheld him, it is not as a stranger."

That we can say,—and one thing more we can add. It is too early to appraise the place which he will hold as men look back upon the history of the church in these great years; but it is not too early to say that whatever the movement of to-day toward unity means to the future, something of that meaning the future will find embodied in Brent.

EDWARD L. PARSONS.

CONSECRATION

Dear Saviour, I am Thine,
And pray that Thou wouldst be to me
A Master to refine
My character by grace,
In grief, or joy, or rest, or strife,
Or cumbering cares that fret this life,
Till Thine own image Thou canst see
As in some holy place.

—*Dwight E. Marvin.*

THE REACTION TO THE CHRISTIAN UNITY PACT

BY DR. FREDERICK LYNCH

Educational Secretary of the Church Peace Union, New York

THE readers of *The Christian Union Quarterly* will recall that in the April issue there was published a Reconciliation Pact which had been signed by sixty-four outstanding leaders of the churches representing most of the large communions of the country. They felt, as was said at the time, that if the nations could sign a pact which looked forward toward the abolition of all strife between them and toward a more united world there was no reason why the churches could not sign a pact which pledged them to the cessation of all strife, to the recognition of their oneness in the kingdom of Christ, and to common worship and service. My readers will remember that the pact emphasized these things. It went a little further however than the renunciation of strife and the recognition of oneness. It definitely pledged all who signed it to the willingness to sit down together at the table of the Lord. This last pledge is of special significance. There are several communions which have long practiced intercommunion. It was really as easy for them to sign a pledge of intercommunion as to sing a hymn together. It was another thing however for the representatives of those communions which have never been willing to celebrate the eucharist with their fellow Christians and which require baptism by immersion, to sign it. Several of them did however, among them Episcopalians, Disciples, and Baptists. The significance of the pact and its meaning for the future will really depend upon how many from these three communions and from the Lutherans will sign it. Presbyterians, Methodists, and Congregationalists have really been one in everything but name and polity for years. At this writing it is difficult to know how many from the three former groups will sign it. It is being circulated among them, I understand, and since those Episcopalians, Disciples, and Baptists who have signed it are very eminent in their communions, it is expected that many more will stand with them.

It has been very interesting to follow the reaction to the pact in the press. The daily press has devoted more attention to it than has the religious press, and, with a few exceptions, been more enthusiastic about it. This lends some credence to the claim made that the laymen are more enthusiastic for reunion than are the clergy. This may be the case, but on the other hand it should always be remembered that the laymen do not always realize the obstacles in the way as acutely as do the clergy. I have generally found that the average layman never quite realizes the cleavage between the sacramental and evangelical approach to Christianity. Be this as it may, the press on the whole has welcomed the pact as a step in the right direction and one of the most significant events in the movement toward unity. The comment from those individuals who could not sign the pact has been extremely sympathetic. They said that they could subscribe to the spirit of it most heartily but that the pledge to intercommunion was practically a pledge to violate a canon of the church which they had promised to obey. They called attention to the fact that the Episcopalian brethren were in a somewhat more difficult situation than those who belonged to the free churches. As one bishop who signed the pact with reservations said: "The situation of those who belong to communions like mine, closely knit and law governed, differs greatly from that of those who belong to congregationally organized bodies." On the other hand some of the Episcopalian brethren believed that if the canon was rightly interpreted it did not forbid intercommunion, and that even if it did forbid the administration of the sacrament at the altar of the church according to the Episcopal office by any clergyman not ordained as a priest in the Episcopalian Church, it did not prohibit an Episcopal minister acting as a co-celebrant with clergy of other communions in a common communion service either in an

Episcopal church or one of any other communion where the Episcopal office is not used. I understand that the correspondence that has followed the issuance of the pact intimates that some of the Episcopal brethren would like to have this whole matter put to the test.

The hesitancy of the Lutheran brethren to sign the pact seems to come not from an unwillingness to recognize the validity of the orders of their brethren in the ministry, nor from an unwillingness to commune together, but from the conviction that the Lutheran Church cannot consider organic union with any group that does not have the doctrine of "justification by faith" written in its creed. The Apostles creed or the Nicene creed are not sufficient basis of unity, although recognized as sufficient at Lausanne so far as doctrine is concerned. "Justification by faith" is one of the fundamental doctrines of the Lutheran churches. Their emphasis upon it is their *raison d'etre.* Perhaps this obstacle may be removed from the path of the Lutherans by an affirmation by the Protestant churches that although this doctrine is not explicitly mentioned in the Apostles or the Nicene creed it is implicit there. How can anyone say "I believe in the Lord Jesus Christ" without avowing in those words that he is saved by him? Anyhow all Protestants hold the doctrine that it is by faith in Christ we are saved and I doubt if any communion would hesitate to assert explicitly its belief in "justification by faith."

Anyhow, the interest shown in the pact has been so great that the Christian Unity League feels justified in calling a conference in New York this fall to discuss its fundamental implications. The League hopes to have more than a thousand signers by that time, and the conference will be made up from that group. St. George's Church (Protestant Episcopal), Stuyvesant Square, New York City, has invited the League to be its guest and several of the most eminent leaders of all the large communions are being asked to lead in the discussions. Laymen as well as clergymen will take part in these discussions and already such enthusiastic interest has been shown in this coming conference that it is bound to be a success. Some of the topics it is proposed to discuss are as follows: "Our Common Agreements"; "Should Test of Fellowship be Definitions and Methods or Purposes and Objectives?"; "The Power of the Spirit of Christ in Removing Barriers"; "Evidences of Our Growth Toward Unity"; and "Our Immediate Possibilities and Practical Adventures"; but as I said above the discussion will center about the Christian Unity Pact.

Personally I hope that most of the discussion will center about intercommunion, as I am glad to note from the suggested program for the continuation committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order meeting at Maloja, Switzerland, this summer, it is going to center. For it is there that the real *impasse* lies. Some will say that before intercommunion comes the question of orders must be settled. If some care to put it that way it does not matter, for it all comes to the same thing. Real intercommunion is a recognition of the validity of the orders of all participating in the sacrament. But whichever way you put it this must come before there can be any real organic union and it is almost a waste of time to go on discussing the questions which form so large a part of our Christian unity conferences. I think that one of the reasons for the general indifference on the part of our church members, clergy as well as laymen, is due to this fact that we talk and talk about unity but do not *do* the one thing that would announce unity to the world as an accomplished fact. A joint communion service at Lausanne, in which ministers of all the great communions represented there officiated at the altar, would have done more to convince the world that we really wanted unity than all the conferences of a century. We have got to come to that somehow or we shall get nowhere. I hope this situation will be squarely faced both at the New York Conference this fall and at the meeting in Maloja this summer. If we cannot soon recognize each other's orders and sit at the Lord's table together we shall lose what little interest we have already aroused in the church at large in Christian unity.

Of course I recognize the difficulty. This mutual recognition of orders, this common celebration of the eucharist seems one of the impossibles, but it is the impossibles that must be surmounted in any great enterprise. My work has brought me in close contact with both the evangelicals and the sacramentalists in the church, and more and more I have realized how far apart they are. One who has not had much contact with both of these groups — as I have had — cannot quite realize how far apart they are. They are so far apart that sometimes it seems as if they held two different religions. To the first group, the evangelical, belong practically all Protestants; to the second group belong all Catholics, whether within the Roman, Greek, or Anglican fold — and their number is increasing in the Anglican fold. The evangelical believes that God is directly apprehended of the human soul. He resents the interposition of a priest of any sort and does not think of the sacrament so much as a means of grace as a memorial service. Religion is individual — it is God and the human soul having dealings with each other. The Gospel is its seat of authority in religion, and it is constantly appealing to the Gospel and seldom mentioning the church. The relation to Christ is through the Gospel and not through the church. In the Gospel one finds Christ and chooses him to be his Lord, Master, and personal Savior. The church has no divine authority. It is simply the company of those who have been saved by the Gospel associating themselves together for mutual helpfulness, service, and worship—although worship is the least emphasized aspect. (If one wants to see the real and ultimate nature of *evangelicalism* or *Protestantism* stated at its best, let him read Dr. T. R. Glover's little book in reply to the Lambeth Appeal, *The Free Churches and Reunion*. Dr. Clifford welcomed it as expressing exactly the point of view of the Free churches. In it the Gospel, and the individual's choice of Jesus, are constantly emphasized as the essence of Christianity. The Lord's supper is simply the meeting of the faithful around the table. Christ may be there in spirit, as he is always where his children are; but the supper has no unique sacramental value. The church is only the association of those who have been saved and its real function is the preaching of the Gospel.) So to the evangelical the Bible, not the church, is the seat of authority in religion. The church came into being simply as the voluntary association of the converts in Jerusalem and elsewhere. Whatever form it assumed as time went on came from growth and natural development, not from divine appointment. The church has always been cherished as the company of the elect, but it is not the chief means of grace nor the final seat of authority in religion. Some of the great evangelical movements of the past have for years pursued their way outside the church, although they have always been drawn back into it again, simply because the law of gravitation of the faithful, the like-minded, the followers of Jesus Christ to each other.

Over against the evangelical group — worlds distant from them — is the sacramental or Catholic group. The sacramentalist or Catholic, whether in the Episcopal or the Roman Church, finds his due approach to God through the sacraments and through the sacraments the grace of God is ministered to him. The church more than the Bible is the seat of authority. The church was before the Bible, and was not simply the society of the faithful naturally meeting together, but was divinely appointed by our Lord and given authority to represent him in the world. It is the perpetuation of Christ, and has his power and speaks with his authority. The evangelical as an individual goes to the Gospel and gets what he may or will from it. The Catholic abhors this individualism, and listens to the divinely guided church for his direction. All the members of the church are of one mind as well as of one soul. Unity, one common mind, is of the essence of Catholicism. The church has the Catholic's love, too, for it is his source of blessing, his divine guide, his home. (The different attitude toward the church on the part of the Protestant and the Catholic is often remarked. This is the cause.) The priesthood was divinely appointed as was the church. Through the church comes salvation. In the church is the voice of God. How to reconcile these two groups with the necessary divergence in all forms of worship will be to my mind the last and greatest task that will confront the church in the achievement of union.

I see no hope of either group giving up one iota of its convictions. How then can unity ever come? Perhaps by all of us accepting both views, even though that be a paradox. Once after I had said practically what I have just said above before the theological school of Copenhagen University, that great soul Bishop Amundsen said to me, with a twinkle in his eye: "I think I hold both views." I replied, "Sometimes I think I do." Perhaps that is the way unity will come, by all of us coming to see that both views of Christianity are true — the sacramental and the evangelical — and by all of us accepting both.

FREDERICK LYNCH.

WHO WILL BUILD THE WORLD ANEW?

Who will build the world anew?
  Who will break tradition's chains?
Who will smite the power of gold?
  Who will chant the spirit's gains?

War and hatred, let them go!
  Caste and creed have had their day;
Pride and lust will lose their power —
  Who will find the better way?

Who will preach that might is weak?
  Who will teach that love is power?
Who will hail the reign of right?
  This his day and this his hour!

Faithless priests and warring lords
  Are as Babylon and Tyre,
Making way for prophet hosts
  Shouting truth in words of fire.

Who will live to slay the false?
  Who will die to prove the true?
Who will claim the earth for God?
  Who will build the world anew?

—*Thomas Curtis Clark.*

THE NEXT STEP TOWARD CHRISTIAN UNITY

BY REV. D. J. EVANS, D. D.
Pastor of the First Baptist Church, Kansas City, Missouri

Our sense of a lack of unity springs at least from three sources. First, there is the prayer as old as Christianity "that they all may be one." This prayer has been on the lips of the saints through the Christian centuries and is now growing in volume. It is not yet, however, a universal prayer, and sometimes we think that those who pray the prayer are "beating in the void their luminous wings in vain."

We are also conscious of the fact that space and time are rapidly contracting. We are being crowded closer and closer together, and, in many respects, other than the geographical we are already one. We take snuff and sneeze together; or, to be more modern, we listen to the same radio programs the world around. Educationally and commercially we are rapidly coming to think alike, and, if we do not find a spiritual unity and spiritual control, our being crowded together will prove disastrous to our civilization. We must either federate or fight. It is either the kingdom of God or moral chaos.

Moreover, we are conscious of the disaster which recently overtook our civilization. We remember all too clearly the barbarous passions that swayed the mind of the world. We discovered, if we did not know it before, that the spirituality of civilization was but a thin veneer. And the same catastrophe can happen again — and may happen to-morrow. So we are, as never before, deeply concerned to discover and create a unified type of moral and spiritual thinking for the race. The recent Conference on Faith and Order at Lausanne revealed an underlying unity as to the message of Christianity. but the divergencies were rather discouraging. They seem so unimportant in the light of the moral victories which Christianity has yet to achieve, and which we believe the Christian message is designed to accomplish.

One may naturally wonder what good would be accomplished by the union of all the Christian forces with their present emphases on historical and traditional matters. One may also ask whether the basis for unity should be sought rather in the future than in the past. We might be able to unite on a program while we utterly fail to agree on a tradition. The quality of unity which might be secured by agreement and compromise with reference to sacraments, creeds, etc., would not necessarily mean much to a confused world.

Let us not forget that vast aggregations have in history been unified on the basis of clearly defined dogma, and yet we are not ready to concede that that type of unity could withstand either the growing spirit of nationalism or the light of modern knowledge. Neither could it supply leadership to secure spiritual dominance over the vast complexities which we recognize as our present civilization. This does not mean that we attempt the impossible. We cannot cut ourselves off from our own history.

The loyalties that now bind us, and also separate us, have their roots in age long traditions and cannot be lightly cast aside, but it ought to be possible for us to reëvaluate all of the past in the light of an unrealized ideal which now challenges us. We are in danger of losing to-morrow precisely because we love yesterday. The present generation has in its hand a powerful weapon of scientific scrutiny and the legends and myths and sacred sentiments are rather ruthlessly dealt with. For weal or woe Christianity will be subjected to the same type of historical investigation that robbed Rome of her Romulus and Hellas of her Helen.

If the past is to be considered, as we make our efforts to unite, there is hope in no other method but that of scientific history. It is useless to ask the present generation to close its eyes and unite for unity's sake. The values of the past can certainly be conserved and a true theory of development can be taken into account. What we must have is a consistent preservation of all useful adaptations and a severe pruning of useless forms.

But even so, a greater hope for unity lies in the possibility of creating a program for the future. It would not be so fatal if we should fail to agree on the past, but it will be fatal if we cannot see together to the point of visualizing a Christian social order. Are we wise enough to criticize our own civilization from the Christian viewpoint, and courageous enough to formulate an ideal which would challenge the spirit of sacrifice and absorb our social energies? The early church went singing to its martyrdom and, in this spirit, conquered. If the church of to-day would seek to imprint the name of Christ on modern industry, political activities, race relations, and international affairs, it would need the same spirit of martyrdom and, in this spirit, would conquer and find its unity.

This was, as I understand it, the mind of the Master. He was courageous enough to reëvaluate the traditions of his own spiritual ancestry and he calmly set aside the outworn and the obsolete. The emphasis of his ministry too, was not on the doctrinal and dogmatic. He went about doing good; raising the fallen; recovering the lost; blessing childhood into a new dignity; restoring joy, freedom, and confidence in the heavenly Father; impatient only with a type of religious thinking that begat ugliness, and bigotry, and hatred. And apparently his world wide vision did not assume that Christian virtues were utterly strange to the nations of the world, for those who had ministered to him in hunger and thirst and nakedness and sickness were to inherit the kingdom of his Father prepared from the foundation of the world.

D. J. EVANS.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF INFANCY

BY EDWIN D. STARBUCK, PH. D.
Director of the Institute of Character Research, University of Iowa,
Iowa City, Iowa

THERE has been for many centuries one absorbing passion of the best minds of the world,—how to bring about friendliness between man and man, man and country, nation and nation, to establish peace and good-will on the earth. I was reading the other day from an ancient Buddhist document, the *Dhammapada,* in answer to the question, "How may our quarrels cease?" It said, "Hatred does not cease by hatred at any time. Hatred ceases only by love. This is an old rule." We have tried every prescription we could think up for the reign of kindliness. Men have preached it with unction even from the housetops; they have written it in codes, recited it in creeds, sung in their poetry; they have legislated for it. In their extremity they have fought for it. They have tried every scheme their fancy could devise, save one,—to implant the spirit of good-will in the muscles and motives of youngsters, so that almost unwittingly they would learn the sweetness and joy of friendliness. This untried way is nature's way, and it is this that I seek to proclaim.

So I propose to stand with you for a few minutes here on the top of the rolling centuries and look up and down the growing years in order to see what the game is that is going on here on the planet. I shall just tell you a story — a sketch of some of the episodes in the earth drama.

My story begins as any story should: Once upon a time, long, long ago, there were no children — in the proper sense no children, for all animals were born or hatched, as the case might be, doing everything that a full grown animal should do: selecting the right food, seeking proper places of safety, and otherwise looking after their own interests. Countless ages passed with the flood of life developing to a little point and then receding into oblivion. It seemed a monotonous story, as when the waves of the sea endlessly beat upon the shore and then recede.

If one should, however, think it a monotonous repetition, it is because he failed to feel the inner urge of the life that was coming and going, for the nature life is an infinite urge, and it has been finding many ways of getting on.

The first of these is through effort. The struggle for existence, we have been taught, is the first law of life. This law is still operative. The passion to be, to create, to increase, is ever with us, so that if modern appliances, as has been computed, adds at least thirty-five slaves to one's personal efficiency, this is part of the age-long program.

And then nature has hit upon the trick of cutting off, killing, and leaving behind the unfit and the misfits. She is always chopping and lopping off and leaving behind not only wrong deeds, but wrong doers, many creatures going to their death every year than is the number of those who live. "Natural selection," it has been called — a most effective and slow and extremely costly way of progress. She has discovered still another trick or device of progress, namely, to predispose before birth or hatching the conduct by placing through hereditary devices surely within the organism tendencies toward right behavior. She has given, as John Fiske has phrased it, to creatures a good deal of their education "before they are born." She has been able to produce miracles of result through this means, as when, for example, a little quail that has had no experience of this planet tumbles out of a shell so constructed in its marvelous mechanism that a thousand million elements of nerve and muscle dance in tune so that the creature can walk, or even run. All these and many more that we have not time to recount are costly, slow, and lumbering ways of progress.

But nature has discovered a better way, and that is this: To attain progress through helpless infancy. She has at last brought children in the world, as helpless as ever can be, and has learned to stretch the days into months, and the months into long years, giving time for a progressive attainment of full maturity. She has learned to scrap her organisms as you would even the priceless machinery in a factory and to bring on a fresh burst of life born out of her womb unspoiled, buoyant, sweet, and fine. She has learned to trust this device essentially alone.

Along with helpless infancy nature has created out of her wisdom solicitous motherhood and tender parenthood, and countless devices for the enrichment of each life through the long period of its growth. This discovery has been the greatest of all. It has paid so well that those creatures who have accepted the joy of caring for offspring have conquered the earth and subjected to its needs all those types of life that have trusted merely to selection and who have gotten too much education before they were born.

If one should ask why this method of progress has been succeeding, the answer is forthcoming, due to the fine work of John Fiske in his little book *The Meaning of Infancy,* to Henry Drummond in the *Ascent of Man,* and to the work of many profound students of nature and of life. We could count out the gains, if we chose, one after another. In the first place, there is the gain of learning, indeed, of learning how to learn. Note the human infant, unlike the creatures that get their education before they are born. It must learn through continued and expensive experience how to grasp an object, how to walk, to use articulate speech, and the scores of fresh situations that every day present themselves. It by and by learns; then, gets into the habit of learning; later, finds pleasure in making difficult adjustments; until, if all has gone well, it acquires such habits of adjustment, which are also habits of growth, that it becomes to imagine that what life has in store for it is progressive acquisition, achievement, attainment. Along this road lies progress.

Another fruitage of lengthening infancy is the pleasure of overcoming difficulties, the joy of the conquering will. One observes the keen pleasure an infant has in learning to place a block on a tottering heap, in mastering some contrivance, in winning in some difficult contest, and finally in imagining itself an actor in a conflict in which all the odds are against it. Every victory over things helps to develop within the life a pearl of great price, the will to conquer, with strength of purpose that finds joy in meeting life squarely and playing its game with vigor. Creatures have learned to find zestfulness in rising on stepping stones of their almost defeated selves to something better. They have learned not only to conquer but to sing out the joy of it as in Browning's lines:

Then welcome each rebuff
That turns earth's smoothness rough,
Each sting that bids
Nor sit, nor stand, but go.
Be our joys three parts pain.

If one should put himself over with fineness of mind and sympathy of heart into the life of growing childhood with the impulse to appreciate the results of lengthened infancy, he would find that all the rays leading toward the light of human knowledge and perfection radiate from this center. In providing for babes, parents become keen of wit and agile of adjustment. They are enriched. Life that has become heavy is made light. Hard hearts are made tender. Drooping years become vitalized. Life's richest values become immediate and real.

There is one result of lengthened infancy and biologically enforced care of childhood so important that it needs a word. The richest flower of human culture is that of kindliness. The soil in which this finest flower has flourished is the countless deeds of solicitation in the life of parents concerning the welfare of their young, even when they are not quite mindful of all that is happening. The mother is forced by selection into the semblance of kindly deeds. Deeds ripen into motives, and deeds and motives are the stuff of which the mind is made. The mother-and-father-care for offspring widens until it creates a very ancient, beautiful, and sacred unit called the family, which has been in the world the garden of beauty and duty and good cheer and all the things that enrich and bless. The deeds of good-will have extended beyond the family until they have burst into the idealisms of universal good-will and even of love.

The child, and what can be done to it and through it, is the hamlet of this world-drama.

When our eyes become really open to this truth it will transform the temper of our conduct and of our dreams. When the scales do fall from our eyes and the vision shall break full upon our thought in the midst of our busy life, it will bring such a revolution of values as will make our whole life *child-centered.* It is now too adult-centered. We adults think this human game exists for us.

The home is too adult-centered. The parents imagine that it is they who must for their own happiness spend time and wealth on parties, banquets, books, jewelry, and expensive pictures, leaving the children out of sight and out of mind. The state is too adult-centered. We have believed that it exists for the sake of the conservation of the wealth and of the advantages of those who make the laws. There are now signs of hopeful transformation. The state of Iowa has elected to give every unfortunate child the benefit of surgical and medical aid. It has established child welfare stations to bring more happiness and well being to healthy children. Pennsylvania with its mothers' helpers' pension is coming to consider itself a mother to its youngsters.

The church is too adult-centered. We grown-ups, we want the sermons preached to us and the wonderful music sung to our delectation, while the little ones in the school of religious education, if such a thing exists, are tucked away in the dark corners of the basement with no person fit to direct it while the great artists of the spirit must stand in the pulpit and administer the bread of life to us who are going to die pretty soon, ought to die cheerfully and with a will, giving place to the youngsters that are coming after. There is hardly a church in Christendom that does not spend more for the one solitary item of church music for the pleasure and delight of the grown-ups than for the whole school of religious education put together. And, mark you, the church is established in the name of one who said: "If anyone will do the least thing to a child, to bring it some water if it is thirsty, some raiment if it is shivering with the cold, a word of kindness,—any least thing to a child,—he is doing it unto me." And by the context he meant, he is doing it also to that blessed Lord of life which he chose to call the Father.

If Jesus should stand again in the midst of the ecclesiastical paraphernalia that has grown up around his name and could observe as of old our grown-up self-centeredness in the midst of which the children have been spilled, he might smile at our innocence or weep over our blindness! He would certainly turn upon us a rebuke, and say, "Let the children come. Forbid them not. Of such is the kingdom of spiritual perfection."

The one brightest spot in American life is the public school. Like a miracle it is springing into perfection with good equipment and highly trained experts who are occupied with bringing life's best mental and spiritual treasures into childhood. Still, even here, our vision becomes clouded. School life instead of being child-centered is too apt to become curriculum-centered and system-centered instead of being the plastic instrument for the attainment of the fullest and richest life of these dynamic centers of spiritual potentiality that the youngsters are.

With the child in the midst, there is only one kind of job worth following: That which will in some wise bring beauty and truth and happiness to the world through childhood. For anyone who will not, there is great condemnation. The gentle soul of Nazareth uttered once an awful truth. "Anyone," he said, "who will cause one of the least of these little ones to stumble, it were better that a millstone be hanged about his neck and that he be cast into the sea."

We have been seeing to-day that most good things have come through the child and what can be done for it. Every inch of victory too has been dearly bought. If I, by an act of omission and neglect or carelessness and indifference, am causing this entire superstructure called civilization to fall like a poor card house around my head, is there anything so terrible it could not happen with justice to me? There are thousands of ways to come under the condemnation. I feel a call to teach and will not; I am busy seeking wealth. I must beware the millstone. Another child might come into the family, and I say it may not, because of the need of personal freedom and of social success. Let me beware the millstone. I am poorly of constitution and cannot be a healthy breeder of happy childhood; but say I too must enjoy the sweets of parenthood; again am I fit only for the millstone. So must one now, henceforth and always, live circumspectly in the presence of childhood.

There is, however, the happier side. Contact with childhood pays. The young, growing life of our species has a beauty all its own. Its comeliness is like that of a wonderful dream-garden. Who has not fineness of soul sufficient to feel its subtle charm? Then, there is joy in creativeness. It is fun to build,—a toy or a house or a mansion or a poem. To help create a perfected humanity through shaping the loves and directing the deeds of children brings to a person of right-mind, joy unspeakable.

Brothers, I propose, for the Lord Christ's sweet sake, a revolution! This time done not in wrath and blood and tears but in love and laughter and fulness of joy. I propose as standard bearer, one Jesus of Nazareth who first put the child centrally in the midst. Let all the "churches of Jesus Christ" in the world join in the revolution. Consecrated souls have always as now, been aching and working for the upbuilding in the world of a kingdom of love and good-will. There is but one great highway leading into the realm of righteousness and that road leads straight through the entrancing fields of childhood.

What shall we do? Well, every good revolution, like charity, should begin at home. Keep on with those wonderful orations called sermons, done for adults. You will always feel better after delivering yourself of them and they will do no harm. But think and act always in terms of childhood. Build children's churches, marvelous in beauty, right in their appointments, appealing by their music, uplifting by their ritual, and peaceful and helpful under wisest leadership. Continue to evangelize a world lost in sin, so long as you have the heart for it; but know full well that the modern world is working at human ills with the same insight as marks their control of bodily disease and the blights of growing plants. The spiritual culture of childhood is evangeline grown thoughtful, preventive, and creative. Keep on if you must with a logical and theological defense of some doctrines or issues. Some day you will catch the Jesus Spirit and you will then "go about doing good," with the "rising generation" as your specialty. Do you seek church unity? There has never been nor is there now anything divisive in educational programs for and with the young.

EDWIN D. STARBUCK.

THE NEW EDEN

When every child shall, through his native gift,
  Be truthward led along the ways of joy;
When every man shall at his labor lift
  Hand, head, and heart to God, who gave employ;

When every one an artist soul shall be,
  At forge or easel, at the desk or loom,
Then through his task shall every man be free,
  And none shall toil, as captive to his doom.

Cities shall then become the shrines of art;
  Towns, gardens all, shall blossom as the May;
Laughter shall thrive, of every life a part,
  And rest await each man at close of day.

Then shall be born the kingdom of the blest;
  In every heart shall love exalted be;
Then God once more shall see His garden drest
  With flower and fruit, and every pleasant tree.

—*Thomas Curtis Clark.*

THE RELIGIONS OF INDIA

BY REV. HENRY A. ATKINSON, D. D.

Secretary of the Church Peace Union, New York

INDIA is the most religious country in the world. Every person has some kind of religion. Everything is connected in some way with religion. Every act of life must conform to religious ceremony, custom, or prejudice. There are 320,000,000 people in India. These are not represented as so many individuals, but primarily as members of various communities determined by religion. The Hindus form the largest community; then come the Moslems, the Christians, the Sikhs, the Jains, and the Parsis. There are a considerable number of animists and many reform groups, but these latter are considered simply as sects or subdivisions. Roughly speaking the Hindus represent three-fourths of the entire population while the Moslems, their closest rivals, represent a little less than one-fourth. The figures are, in round numbers, 240,000,000 Hindus, 70,000,000 Moslems, and about 10,000,000 others.

Hinduism is difficult to define and has so many forms and appears in such a variety of shapes, that it almost baffles description. At Benares one finds the river lined with temples and bathing places filled with devoted pilgrims, some of whom have come thousands of miles to bathe in the sacred waters of the Ganges. Anyone who dies within the precincts of the city is specially blessed by having the otherwise ceaseless round of existence stopped. Many come, therefore, to die in Benares; hence the burning ghats are kept busy. Back from the riverside in the precincts of the golden temple, in its narrow alleyways and passages, one is jostled by crowds — eager, hungry, sick, filthy, clamorous, pathetic — all of them drawn by the magic of this ancient religion. The sacred cows walk at leisure among this throng. A leper looks at you with frightful, distorted features and holds out hands with stumps for fingers asking for alms. Through it all, with an air of majesty, stalks the Brahmans — some of them scholars, all of them superior. This is Hinduism just as the scenes by the riverside are Hinduism. Or you can go from there to the "monkey temple" where a goat is offered every morning as a blood sacrifice. Out of the temple funds and gifts are fed the monkeys which swarm over the temple and the trees in its area, and are held sacred by the people. Or you may visit another temple where the crudest form of worship is tolerated and where the obscenities of the decorations make impossible a description fit for publication.

Leaving Benares you may visit the temple at Kalighat near Calcutta from which the modern city took its name. In this temple are many emblems of Siva for it is dedicated to Kali, his wife. Here is the fountain head of the mother worship — and what a ferocious mother she is with her blood red tongue and her girdle of human heads! In one of the court yards hundreds of goats are sacrificed every day. The throngs that come here are numbered by the thousands. In addition to the ordinary pilgrims, holy men, priests, and curiosity seekers, there are hundreds of women who come to pray for special benefits and others who bring their children to dedicate them to the goddess and leave a part of the first hair cut from the child's head at the foot of the sacred tree as a votive offering because she has heard and answered their prayer. In an earlier time human sacrifices were offered in this temple and now frequently some rich devotee offers a bullock or a buffalo. The priest who wields the axe stands with bared arm, the huge curved sword in his hand. The goats are washed in the sacred Ganges and brought bleating and crying into the area red and slippery with the blood of those who have trodden that path before. The head is placed between a forked stick and a cross piece fastened down to hold it in place. Then an assistant priest, pulling the animal out at full length, holds it in position while the priest with one blow severs its head. With a swing the body is thrown upon the pavement, its blood sprinkled on the garments of the encircling crowd, and now there is a scramble to dip handkerchiefs in the flowing stream. The surging crowd, the beating of the tomtoms, the smell of human bodies, the ghastly pallor of the half starved beggars, again the lepers, underneath filth and dirt, and above all a burning sun — it is all crude, nauseating, disgusting beyond words. I asked a professor of philosophy how he, being a Hindu, looked upon Kalighat and its worship. His reply gives a true glimpse of Hindu thought, "I do not think about it. I have no interest in it. Why should I waste my time either in condemning or condoning what is outside the circle of my interests?"

The philosophy of this man is of the very highest and noblest type. According to his thinking religious experience may be grouped under four heads. The first and highest is that which recognizes God as a spirit. There is no need for any form of mediation between the soul and God. There is no place for priest, temple, or temple worship. It is the soul of the individual living in the presence of and controlled by the great oversoul of the universe. The second form, which is lower, is that which conceives of God in some personal form, either as father, creator, preserver, or upholder. He is a being who does something, a sentient personality at the center of the universe. For those who cannot conceive of God as pure spirit this second form takes its place. It may be possible for an individual alone to live in the presence of such a God, but for the great majority of the people it is essential that there shall be some form of mediation between the soul and its God.

The third form of religious experience is found among those who build for themselves images of their god. The idol represents to them the idea. This third group does not worship the idol as a god in itself; they know that the wood of which it is made is the same as the wood out of which the temple in which it is housed is constructed. If it is of brass or gold it is the same as other brass or gold. They venerate and respect it just as we might venerate and respect the picture of a mother or a father long dead. In some cases we might almost worship the picture. We know, however, that the picture is not the mother or the father, but that it is simply the symbol, and every time we look at it our mind goes back to that parent and our hearts are filled with gratitude and love. The stations of the cross, the statue of the Virgin Mary in the Catholic churches, the stained glass windows, the pictures of the parables, of Christ, the form of the cross itself which is used by Christians, Protestants as well as Catholics—these things are all aids to worship. So this group depends upon a materialization of God. God must be made concrete. The image must be before the eyes in actual form. The fourth and lowest form of worship is pure animism. It is the worship of spirits, the worship of animals, the worship of bushes, of trees, of rivers. To the animist there is no god except in these concrete forms. To such a worshipper the image before which he bows is not the only god he knows, but it is one of the many, and if you destroy the image or cut down the tree you destroy and kill one of his divinities.

Now Hinduism is so comprehensive that it embraces all of these different forms. Every type of worship and every conception of God finds within it a congenial home. There is no absolute norm by which one being a Hindu can determine whether or not he is orthodox. The caste system which grew up with the religion provides the social structure within which the lives of the people are lived. The prohibitions, the commandments, the taboos are all determined by this social structure and these are in themselves a part of the religion. For instance, in the beginning there were only four castes — the Brahmans or priests who sprung from the head of Brahma; the soldiers who came from his shoulders, the merchants and traders who came from his body, and the laborers who came from his feet. Now these four castes have been multiplied, divided, remultiplied and redivided until to-day there are literally thousands of castes and sub-castes and in addition a great mass of outcasts — those having no caste and no caste relations.

The word "Hinduism" means the religion of Hind, the old name for India, and all of these castes, high and low, and even the great group of outcasts are children of one mother.

From time to time through the last five thousand years there have risen new religions and new forms of worship that came into collision with Hinduism and threatened at times to destroy it. The Jains came probably early in the sixth century B.C., certainly earlier than the Buddhists, and began a reform movement, preaching an austere doctrine of life which captured the imagination of the Indian people. Jainism spread over a large part of the country. With the birth of Gautama Buddha there came a new religious impulse and a new movement which swept across India. Hinduism withstood the shock and just as the social system of India has absorbed almost an endless procession of invading peoples, so Hinduism absorbed Buddhism within itself, driving out from the center those who would not be absorbed. Consequently to-day we have the strange phenomena that in India, the place of its birth, there are but few Buddhists and those that remain are recognized by the Hindus as being more or less a sect of Hinduism. The same is true of Jainism which is a part of the Hindu system. Its doctrines are different in some respects, but as Professor Rhadakrisnan said to me, "Hinduism, like a loving mother, has taken this child to her breast and it is also one of her brood."

There are approximately four million Christians in India, the great majority of them Roman Catholics. This church with its worship of the Virgin Mary as the mother of God, its pictures, its emphasis upon altar service, its priests, its robes, its incense, its bells, its music, makes a strong appeal to the Indian imagination. In the eighteenth century a group of Roman Catholic priests made such progress that they were known throughout the country as the "white Brahmans" and Hinduism was willing to accept them as one of its sects. Seeing the danger from this the Vatican interfered. To-day the most significant Christian movement in India is that by which whole villages become Christian. The headman makes a decree and the entire village is baptized. This movement, however, does not change the people's method of life. I said to one of the best Christians I met in India, a man born a Christian whose father and grandfather were Christians before him, "I have not met a single Indian Christian but what I have had the feeling that one would not have to dig very deep to find the foundation stone of Hinduism." Smilingly he replied, "That is perhaps true, but what you find is not Hinduism but Indian." "True," I answered, "what is the difference?" He could not tell me. Many a man has accepted Christ, but still calls himself a Hindu and many a Christian still thinks of Kali when he prays to the Virgin Mary. S. K. Natarajan, the editor of *The Social Reformer,* of Bombay, said to me, "I cannot tell where I quit being a Hindu and become a Christian or where I quit being a Christian and become a Hindu." Dr. Nair, a devoted Buddhist with whom I dined, took me before dinner on to the roof of his house and showed me his shrine where he spends an hour every morning in private devotion before starting out on his busy round of duties. In this shrine he has set up three statues of Buddha, one large image with a smaller one on either side, and around the walls are hung pictures of a number of saints — Indian, Chinese, Buddhist, Hindu, Jain, Confucian—and in the place of greatest honor, a picture of Christ. I saw this same picture in dozens of homes.

In the north, in the home of the principal of the Arya-Samaj, was a beautiful reproduction of the Christ of the Transfiguration. It was the first object I saw as I entered the drawing room. The Arya-Samaj broke from the Brahmo-Samaj on the ground that the Brahmo-Samaj was too Christian. They object to it because they do not want to abandon Hinduism, and yet the leader had this picture of Christ on the wall. A leading missionary told me that the most significant thing that was happening in the religious life of India to-day is the rapprochement between Hinduism and Christianity. "When," he said, "the time comes that Christianity will be recognized as one of the sects of Hinduism; that is, a part of the religious system of the nation, it will have won its greatest victory." Others with whom I talked agreed with him, but of course I found many Christians who bitterly resented any such statement. One missionary for instance said to me, "We are not here to make better Hindus or better Jains or better Moslems; we are here to make Christians." The lap of Hinduism is ample enough for all her children. The type of unity that is being established in this way is unique. No other place in the world presents such problems as India and in no other place could you have the same coördination of interests.

The only group that has successfully stood out against Hinduism is Mohammedanism, but two facts need to be considered here. First of all Mohammedanism is not itself a unity. There are two major divisions found in India — the Sunnites, those who came from Arabia, and the Shiahs who came through the Kyber Pass from Persia. These two groups are fully as antagonistic to each other as either one of them can be toward Hinduism. It is true the Moslems form a community, but it is really two communities. In fact it is more than this for there is another division that is influential, especially in and around Lahore, the Amadiah movement. All Mohammedans look for a coming Messiah; the Amadiahs say that the Messiah has already come. They are aggressive and strongly missionary, but like so many aggressive, proselyting groups they are hard to live with and have split among themselves so that there are two groups of Amadiahs. "I am a Moslem," said a physician to me who had studied in London, Leipzig, and Chicago, "but in my sympathies and my national outlook I am a Hindu." The Swaraj movement is bringing together all these groups and ironing out the many differences and difficulties that now exist.

The Parsis form a small community. There are only a hundred thousand of them but they are very influential in Bombay and one or two other points throughout India. This community is not aggressive for their religion and is not missionary in spirit. In fact no one can become a Parsi even if he should so desire. If one of the community marries a non-Parsi he is lost to the community. In everything except their form of worship they are, however, Hindus and stand with those of the Hindu faith. I talked to a leading educator in the north and, in enumerating the religious forces of the country, he readily accepted the Parsis as a part of the Hindu system. "They worship differently and there are distinctions, but at heart they are one with the rest of the Hindu world."

A visit to the Mohammedan mosque will convince anyone of the strong influence of Hinduism upon the other religions. The mosques in India are fully as much like Hindu temples as they are like the mosques of Turkey. Of course the Moslem is strictly monotheistic and fanatically opposed to the use of images and pictures in his worship, but in some of the mosques I saw pictures and in the enclosures of several of the principal ones there were statues, a thing that would not be tolerated in Egypt, Arabia, Turkey, or any other part of the Mohammedan world.

We hear a great deal about the clash between the different communities and it is often said that there can be no peace between Mohammedan and Hindu. Miss Mayo dwells at great length upon this fact as an important if not the chief bar to self-government. Without entering into a discussion of the question I am frank to say everything I saw tended to make me believe that there is no essential difference between these two communities. They live in peace just as long as they are left alone. I was told by a leading Parsi, on my first day in Bombay, that the clashes between communities were fomented for the benefit of some party or parties that were interested in keeping the people apart. He said to me, "You watch. If there comes a government crisis there will be an outbreak of communal trouble at some point." I had not long been in India before I began to be aware of the secret police and to hear reports of the underground methods that were used for keeping track of the people. In February the government had a bill that it was trying to force through the legislative council giving the police greater authority in hunting down communists and stamping out sedition. There was serious opposition to the bill for it was sincerely felt that it invaded many of the inherent rights of the people. While the bill was being debated at Delhi trouble between Hindus and Moslems broke out in Bombay. It was one of the worst riots that has occurred in recent years. Now it may have been a mere coincidence — having no evidence to the contrary I am willing to accept it as much — but at any rate it was a fortunate circumstance for those who wanted the bill. It gave a splendid argument in favor of its passage.

Nowhere else is there to be found a solid block of 240,000,000 people like-minded in religious matters such as one finds in the Hindu world. Whenever in other places any religious party has become dominant, it has at the same time become so overbearing and tyrannical that the people could scarcely get along with it or without it or its leaders. Conformity is the demand always made by religious majorities. In India Hinduism holds the prior claim and the superiority in numbers and yet to-day its leaders are responsible for the amazing degree of unity that is so much in evidence.

Another thing that impressed me in India and other places in the East is the fact that each religion is fighting a battle for its own existence. The same forces that are opposing Christianity in America are opposing Hinduism in India and the religion of Islam in Egypt, Turkey, and Persia; Confucianism in China; Buddhism in Burma; and Shintoism in Japan. Every religion is being challenged. Materialism and a mechanistic concepton of the world are battering at the walls of every religious ideal and establishment. One hears on every hand from thoughtful men in India the statement that the present miserable condition of the country is the result of religion. "It has served as a narcotic lulling the minds of the people to sleep." "What we need in India," said a young student to me, "is the complete destruction of all religion. Until this is accomplished there can be no independence and no progress for the nation and the people." "What will you put in its place?" I asked him. "Self assurance, courage, hope instead of despair, buoyancy instead of depression, independence instead of servility. Why should a nation like ours be bowed down from one end to the other by fear of the gods and the wrath of the gods when every thinking individual knows there are no gods; that they are simply bogeys manufactured by the priests and played upon by masters and governments to keep the people in a state of submission?" Were this simply the opinion of one man it would be of no particular importance.

In every city, I visited the book stores and asked what books the people were reading, and learned that it is the writers who have abandoned religion whose books are in greatest demand. This is no time for any religion to attempt to set itself over against the others. It is not a question of whether one religious system shall survive. The question is, will any survice? On the other hand thousands of thoughtful people realize that the present world-wide onslaught against religion must be met in some effective way. "Man cannot live by bread alone." Success, democracy, wealth, ease, comfort, pleasure, progress — all of these things are meaningless except as they are interpreted in terms of some great purpose underlying life. There are some who think that a synthetic religion can be created; that a little of this and a little of that system can be brought together to form a new faith that will appeal to men and women throughout the world with strength enough to gain their supreme allegiance. The hope in such a religious system is vague. Religions are born out of great convictions. They come from the heart of the people. Soviet Russia having destroyed for its votaries their ancient religion, has created a new religion in the worship of Lenin. His picture has taken the place in thousands of homes of the old ikons. Pilgrimages of the faithful are made to his tomb in Moscow. But this was not brought about by a decree nor by the resolution of a party or a group of thinkers. To the Bolsheviks of Russia Lenin stands as the symbol of their liberation and out of their love for him created this new religion. Without doctrine, without creed, without form of worship, it is a religion nevertheless.

The new psychology is making itself felt through the East. This psychology, emphasizing as it does a re-interpretation of sex and sex life, is closely interwoven with the whole movement for the emancipation of woman from the age-long disabilities and wrongs under which she has suffered, bringing her into more complete harmony with the forces that are shaping the modern world. According to the old religions of India a woman's husband is her god. He worships for the family; she worships him. The papers and magazines are filled with discussions of the new ideals of life, of marriage, of the larger freedom for women, and the question of over population. The ignorance and illiteracy of one-half of the people is being recognized as a serious bar to progress and democratic ideals. Women are abandoning the veil, are refusing to be restricted by the old customs and laws. In other words, the revolt has become a revolution throughout the East. In India it is a common thing to see a mother dressed in the old style observing all the old forms with a daughter as modern and up to-date as any American or English flapper.

One need but visit the shops or sit in the lobby of the hotel, or ride through the streets and keep his eyes open to see what is going on in the minds of the women. Of course this is superficial, the thing that is on the surface. Underneath there is a more serious purpose and determination expressed in the life and work of women like Dr. S. Muthalakshmi Reddi of Madras, Madame Naidu, and scores of others. Public opinion has crystallized and in spite of the frantic appeals of the old orthodox graybeards child marriage will soon be a thing of the past. In discussing Miss Mayo's book one of the chief feminist leaders said to me, "We do not deny the evils that Miss Mayo has pictured, but we deeply resent the fact that she failed to consult with any of the women who are fully as cognizant of these flaws in our social life as she could possibly be. In all her trip through India she did not even attempt to find out what we women are doing or thinking, and there is not one word in her book that indicates that any improvement has been made in conditions in the last twenty years. The horrible pathologic conditions and the sadistic cases cited are all taken from hospital records of thirty-eight years ago." Since leaving India I have visited Burma, the Straits Settlements, China, and Japan and everywhere the same factors are at work. The future of democracy, of religion, of popular government, of law, of the family, of civilization, of life itself here in the East is dependent upon this movement among the women.

What can be said regarding Christianity in view of the East as we find it to-day? Communities are determined in the East by their religious faith. A true Egyptian is a Moslem as is an Arab or a Persian. In India the nationalistic movement looks with suspicion upon every individual who is not either a Hindu or a Moslem. In China the present government has declared for religious tolerance; still, Confucianism is the religion of China. Six out of the nine officials of the present Nanking government are Christians, but throughout the country a Christian is still looked upon with a bit of suspicion. The great forces of nationalism that were released by the war are coming to their fruition. Christianity in India in proportion as it identifies itself with the Indian people will succeed. The South Indian Church holds in itself the key to the future. By the union of the Episcopalians, Congregationalists, and Wesleyans there has been created a new church which expresses the ideals of India. It is part and parcel of the national consciousness. Undoubtedly other Christian denominations will come into it and this church will become the norm of the Christian Church for the whole country. With wisdom and courage those who have formulated the plan have cut through at one stroke all the difficulties in the situation. For the present the ministry in all the churches will be recognized, but at the end of one generation those who serve in the Indian Church will be required to be ordained by the bishops of this church. For immediate purposes there will be consecrated bishops from the Congregationalists and Wesleyans, and in the ordination there will be the Congregational usage and in addition the Episcopalian rite. In faith, in polity, in program, in practice this church is ideal and sets the goal that might well be followed in other parts of the world. There is opposition to it. Some of the powerful leaders in the Anglican Church at home have opposed it, but as one of the bishops said to me, "This church in India is of such significance to the kingdom of God that we shall go ahead with our plans even if the worst fears of Bishop Gore are realized."

What about religion in India? That is the thing I set out to discuss. Frankly, I do not know. These paragraphs are simply lights that flash from a few sides of this many-sided problem. I am sure of only one thing: the forces of democracy are on the march and puny hands raised to stay their progress will be stricken down; raucous voices crying out against democracy will go unheeded and comfortable ecclesiastics ensconced behind special privilege like the Dean of St. Paul, who decry its future and see in it no value, will be ridden down. The real problems that face all religions are the problems that face this common world democracy. If our present religious systems can furnish these marching forces with the spiritual values upon which they must depend and keep before the eyes of man the true goal of life, they will continue. If they fail, like the philosophy of the old alchemists they will disappear, and their appeals like the myths and fairy tales of Greece and Rome will continue only to amuse the childish minds of those who are incapable of grasping the meaning of this mightiest of all human revolutions.

I believe Christianity has the greatest opportunity in all its history, but the only way it can meet this opportunity is by seriously interpreting, in terms of every day life, in every country the weighty decisions taken first at Stockholm and afterwards at the Jerusalem Conference.

HENRY A. ATKINSON.

On Board S.S. Chenonceaux.

INTOLERANCE

Across the way my neighbor's windows shine;
His roof-tree shields him from the storms that frown;
He toiled and saved to build it, staunch and brown;
And though my neighbor's house is not like mine,
I would not pull it down!

With patient care my neighbor, too, had built
A house of faith, wherein his soul might stay,
A haven from the winds that sweep life's way.
It differed from my own — I felt no guilt —
I burned it yesterday.

—*Molly Anderson Haley.*

THE UNITED LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA AS AN INTRA-DENOMINATIONAL MOVEMENT IN CHURCH UNION

BY REV. ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, PH. D., D. D.

Professor of Church History, Lutheran Theological Seminary,
Gettysburg, Pa.

PENNSYLVANIA has a larger number of Lutherans than any other state in the union, although the chief strength of the Lutheran Church in America is in the middle west and the northwest. And Pennsylvania is the chief center of the United Lutheran Church, the largest and most vigorous body of Lutherans in this country. It is eminently proper, therefore, that we should turn to the United Lutheran Church for an outstanding illustration of intra-denominational union. It may serve as a sample of the technique of denominational consolidation.

The formation of the United Lutheran Church in America in 1918 was in reality a reunion. It was the result of a merger of the three general bodies which embraced the oldest branch of Lutheranism in the western world, that branch which dates from the earliest colonial days and which is sometimes called the Lutheranism of the Muhlenberg development. These three general bodies, or their main constituent elements, had once been united in a single organization known as the General Synod. But during the middle period of the nineteenth century, that period of strife and conflict in all phases of American life, several serious breaches took place in the ranks of the General Synod. The Civil War itself produced a breach. The southern synods withdrew and in 1863 organized a general synod in the South (later called the United Synod in the South). A second breach came in 1866 when the Ministerium of Pennsylvania withdrew from the General Synod and, together with a number of smaller synods, organized the General Council. This breach took place partly for reasons of doctrine, more largely for reasons of polity, and still more largely for reason of personality. It caused serious disruption not only in the general body, but also in district synods and in congregations, in educational institutions and in the agencies of benevolence. For nearly two generations the General Synod and the General Council presented the aspect of two rival bodies, almost equal in size, with the same historical background and occupying the same territory. But they both grew rapidly and they both expanded until, at the close of the century, the district synods of both of them extended to the Pacific.

Now the reunion of these three bodies and the organization of the merged body in 1918 took place with a suddenness that startled many of the observers. But as a matter of fact the times were ripe for just such an event and for more than a generation the way had been preparing. In fact it cannot be emphasized too strongly at this time that the denominational consolidation that took place among Lutherans in 1918 was not the result of mere legislative enactments on the part of ecclesiastical judicatories in 1917 and 1918. Else, we believe, it could not have attained the success that it has attained. It was much more than that. It was the ripe fruit of a long process of organic development whereby the Lutherans of these bodies had really attained fundamental unity among themselves.

It would be an interesting exercise, if there were time to engage in it, to indicate how these three bodies during the forty years preceding their merger were gradually approaching one another, along the lines of benevolence and polity, along the lines of doctrine and liturgy (see Wentz, *Lutheran Church in American History,* 1923, chaps. 19, 22, 23).

For Lutherans are always more interested in unity than in union, more concerned about the Christian Church as the communion of the saints than about the Christian Church as the corporation of the saints and they believe that to manufacture a union where there is no real unity is not a creative process, but in the end a disruptive and destructive process. I take it that you will be interested in the series of events indicating the lines of gradual rapprochement, the lines that led to a complete understanding of one another and so paved the way for the merger.

One of the first steps toward the reapproach of the separated Lutherans of the three eastern bodies was taken less than a decade after the schism had occurred. In 1873 the General Synod proposed an interchange of delegates. The General Council proposed instead an informal colloquium of representative men from the different bodies to determine what is the Lutheran faith. When no official action could be had a "Free Lutheran Diet" was held in 1877. This was originated by the private efforts of Dr. Morris of Baltimore, a leading minister of the General Synod and Dr. Seiss of Philadelphia, a leading minister of the General Council. All Lutherans, clerical and lay, without regard to synodical connections, were invited to seats and membership in the diet. The venture was so successful that a second diet was held the next year. Thoroughly prepared papers were read and discussed and the proceedings of each diet were published in a volume that cast much light on living questions in the Lutheran Church.

Shortly after that the three general bodies began to co-operate successfully in the work of liturgical reform. The preparation of a common service and a common hymnal and a common book of ministerial acts brought together many of the leading personalities of the different bodies and taught them to understand one another, to respect one another's sincerity and loyalty, and to labor together in a common cause. This work extended over a long period of years and continued with constantly increasing scope up to the very time of the merger. The harmonious commingling of personalities that it produced, as well as the common liturgical consciousness that it developed, did more than any other one factor to pave the way for the organic union of 1918.

In 1895 the harmonious relations among the bodies had reached the point where they could begin to exchange official fraternal visitors. This resulted in 1898 in the First General Conference of Lutherans in America. This conference differed from the diets of twenty years earlier by being officially sponsored by the general bodies. The expressed purpose of the conference was "to prepare the way for a better understanding and a more harmonious coöperation among the Lutherans" in the General Synod, the General Council, and the United Synod of the South. The conference was repeated in 1902 and again in 1904. The meetings attracted much attention and called together representative men from all three parts of the church. The papers and discussions dealt with practical as well as doctrinal questions, laying special emphasis upon the common heritage of Lutherans; and the three volumes of proceedings did much to remove misunderstandings and to promote the spirit of unity.

The celebration in 1883 of the four hundredth anniversary of Luther's birth was another factor promoting the spirit of unity among Lutherans. It led to a general review of Luther's life and teaching, and a higher appreciation of our common Lutheran heritage. Many Lutherans awoke for the first time to a real understanding of the distinctive features of Lutheranism as they witnessed the profound respect that the reformer commanded among the best men of other Protestant churches. The celebration assembled great multitudes of people and aroused intense enthusiasm. The Lutherans of each locality coöperated in the celebration without regard to synodical bounds. The literature inspired by the occasion, including two English translations of the life of Luther, helped to foster the spirit of common devotion to Lutheran standards. A number of general Lutheran undertakings can be traced to this anniversary.

Then there appeared a number of volumes that tended to cultivate a sense of oneness among all the Lutherans in America. Wolf's popular history of the *Lutherans in America* diffused among the people a wider outlook and a deeper acquaintance with the church as a whole. Jacobs' history of the Lutheran Church in this country helped to develop the historical perspective and an appreciation of our common life as Lutherans. A book on *The Distinctive Doctrines and Usages of the Evangelical Luthern Church,* containing one chapter each by representatives of all the general bodies, frankly indicated the differences in point of view and, at the same time, showed the essential unity in fundamentals among the three eastern bodies. The *Luthern Manual* by Dr. J. B. Remensnyder and the several Lutheran "handbooks" and annual "almanacs" also helped to obliterate inter-ecclesiastical lines by including all bodies in the enumeration of Lutheran strength and assets in this country. This study of the history and general standing of the church as a whole led men to cultivate the nation-wide view and to think of themselves as members of the Lutheran Church rather than as members of a particular synod.

In the meantime the General Synod, General Council, and the United Synod of the South had begun to coöperate along several lines of practical work. Very cordial relations were maintained among the foreign missionary agencies of the three bodies. For a time the Lutherans of the South supported a missionary in connection with the General Synod's mission at Guntur in India. Later the General Council and the United Synod coöperated in the mission work in Japan. The Foreign Mission Boards of the General Synod and the General Council sometimes exchanged missionaries and performed various mutual services in connection with the missions in Guntur and Rajahmundry. This resulted in frequent conferences and a more fraternal attitude on the part of prominent workers in the several bodies. On the home mission field increasing efforts were made to prevent friction between the General Synod and the General Council. A committee on arbitration was appointed by the General Council in 1895 and a commission on practical coöperation a few years later. In 1909 these were consolidated into the home mission arbitration commission. This commission labored effectively with a similar commission of the General Synod and greatly reduced the points of interference in the home mission enterprise. In this way on the foreign and home missionary fields the interests of the church as a whole were put above the interests of separate organizations within the church.

Another factor in the preparation for the merger is found in the numerous agencies that helped to bring together representatives of the different bodies and make them better acquainted. Such is, for example, the Luther Society of New York City, which originated in the Luther Jubilee of 1883. It is an association of laymen of standing without regard to their synodical relations, which holds an annual celebration on reformation day and an annual banquet in the winter. Another such organization is the Lutheran Social Union of Philadelphia which for many years has brought the ministers and laymen of the different bodies together in a social way. Other cities had similar associations. The Young People's Lutheran Association, which in 1893 changed its name to "The Luther League," spread over all the general bodies and performed a splendid service in training the rising generation of church members into a sense of Lutheran unity that ignores synodical differences. A similar function was performed for other groups of Lutherans by such organizations as the pan-Lutheran missionary conferences among students, the conference of Lutheran educators, the conference of Lutheran editors, the Lutheran Brotherhood, the Laymen's Missionary Movement, the Lutheran Historical Society, the Lutheran ministerial unions in various centers, and the Woman's Missionary Society. In all these ways the ministers and laymen of the three bodies frequently met together face to face in friendly consultation and thus there grew up a general spirit of fraternity and good-will that was very important in preparing the way for their ultimate union.

When the age of larger units dawned the spirit of the new denominationalism had done its work and Lutherans began to face the fact that their various efforts to form "general" bodies had been painfully unsuccessful. Lutheran unity, the professed aim of many a diet and conference, was now taken for granted, and Lutheran union, long and earnestly disclaimed, became a subject of discussion wherever representatives of different general bodies were gathered together. By the middle of the second decade in the new century the situation was such that it needed only some extraordinary occasion to bring about a merger of the three bodies.

The occasion was furnished by the quadri-centennial of the Reformation in 1917. The plans for the celebration of the four hundredth anniversary were laid on a most elaborate scale. As early as 1909 the General Council invited the General Synod, the United Synod, and other Lutheran bodies in the United States to coöperate in a worthy celebration. By 1913 the three eastern synods had appointed committees to coöperate and the next year these committees organized as the "Joint Committee on the Celebration of the Quadri-Centennial of the Reformation." The joint committee opened offices in Philadelphia and called an executive secretary, and it was within this committee that the first formal step was taken toward organic union of the three bodies.

At a meeting of the joint committee on April 18, 1917, several lay members of the committee presented a resolution that had been adopted the evening before by a gathering of eight laymen requesting the joint committee to arrange a general meeting of Lutherans to formulate plans for the unification of the Lutheran Church in America. After an all-day discussion, in which the laymen strongly pressed for immediate and organic union, the following resolution was adopted by the joint committee with practical unanimity: "Believing that the time has come for a more complete organization of the Lutheran Church in this country, we propose that the General Synod, the General Council, and the United Synod of the South, together with all other bodies one with us in our Lutheran faith, be united as soon as possible in one general organization to be known as 'The United Lutheran Church in America.' " The presidents of the three general bodies, who by this time were coöperating with one another quite regularly, were requested to appoint a committee to prepare a constitution for the new organization that might be submitted to the general bodies at their meetings that year.

The committee on constitution was appointed, and after much strenuous labor the constitution for the merged body was completed. A few weeks later, June 20-27, 1917, it was solemnly ratified by the General Synod. The General Council adopted it October 24-29, 1917, and the United Synod of the South did likewise November 6-8, 1917. The instrument was then submitted to the district synods and every one of the forty-six synods composing the three general bodies promptly ratified it in the prescribed manner, except the Augustana Synod, the Swedish body, which because of its distinctive problems and special needs formally but amicably withdrew from the General Council. The three bodies appointed a joint ways and means committee to prepare the foundations and set up the machinery for the operation of the new church. This committee performed its difficult and delicate task with eminent success. During the week of November 11, 1918, each of the general bodies held an adjourned meeting in New York City, completing its business as a separate organization, and then, November 14-16, all of them joined in the general meeting in that city that constituted the first convention of the United Lutheran Church in America.

The formation of the larger body involved the willing surrender of many a cherished right and the legal transfer of many millions of dollars worth of property. The new body embraced forty-five district synods covering all parts of the United States and Canada and aggregating more than a million baptized members, with about 2,800 ministers and nearly 4,000 churches. It received a strong compact form of organization from the very beginning. During the ten years of its existence the membership has increased by more than one-third and the volume of its work, as indicated, for example, by the financial outlay, has more than doubled.

As soon as union was achieved in one general organization the various overlapping and competing synods began negotiations looking toward the readjustment of synodical lines that would unite the Lutheran forces of each district in one common aim and purpose. This has gone on apace, until the 45 constituent synods have been reduced to 35; and two more synodical mergers are in prospect, one in New York state, which will be consummated in a few weeks, and one in Pennsylvania, which will be consummated in the uncertain future. Educational mergers will soon be the order of the day.

In short, the United Lutheran Church in America was the logical consummation of the events of half a century. The general satisfaction with the union is due to the previous fact of genuine unity.

ABDEL ROSS WENTZ.

A PRAYER FOR THE SPIRITUAL UNION OF MANKIND

Eternal God, father of all souls,
Grant unto us such clear vision of the sin of war
That we may earnestly seek that coöperation between nations
Which alone can make war impossible.

As man by his inventions has made the whole world
Into one neighborhood
Grant that he may, by his coöperations make the whole world
Into one brotherhood.

Help us to break down all race prejudice
Stay the greed of those who profit by war, and
The ambitions of those who seek an imperialistic conquest
Drenched in blood.

Guide all statesmen to seek a just basis
For international action in the interests of peace,
Arouse in the whole body of the people an adventurous willingness,
As they sacrificed greatly for war,
So, also, for international good-will
To dare bravely, think wisely, decide resolutely,
And to achieve triumphantly. Amen.

—*Bulletin of the Federal Council of Churches.*

CHURCH FEDERATIONS

BY REV. ROSS W. SANDERSON, D. D.

Administrative Secretary of the Wichita Council of Churches,
Wichita, Kansas

CHURCH federation is not the same as church unity. Most church federation leaders are in favor of church union, but officially they represent the coöperative spirit, not the merger impulse. Church unity in the spiritual sense is the pre-condition and the inevitable result of their work. With organic union they have nothing to do officially. Church federation is a part of the stream which flows from Stockholm and bears a precious cargo of life and work out of the present into the future. It is not specifically related to that other river which flows from Lausanne, bearing another cargo of faith and order. Church federation assumes the ecclesiastical *status quo.* It does nothing officially to change it, although it looks with favor on all that tends to reduce the competitive spirit. Some supporters of church federation would be against even the Federal Council if it meant "church union in a hundred years."

Church federation thinks in terms of John Drinkwater's *The Deed.* It is what the Germans used to call American activismus (now they call it fordismus) applied to things ecclesiastical. It may seem nervous, restless, jerky, as compared with the slow patience of the Christian unity movement. It craves action now. Church federation assumes that the law of the jungle is one which churches ought also to attain. The churches are only recognizing that "the strength of the wolf is the pack," when they practice comity. Of course in wide stretches of America there is no formal comity. Some places have the spirit of it without the letter. Sometimes the breaches of comity are so flagrant and so fatal as to produce the spirit of comity as a natural reaction in the minds of reasonable people. City planning, the positive approach, is a more attractive method in new territory; but how about the fully occupied and over-churched fields? Can the churches learn to give up?

Obviously there is not one type of peace for Methodists and another for Presbyterians. World peace is not a denominational matter. Yet how empty it is for a divided church to expect a politically united world. And why should there need to be so many peace agencies? If the church were at peace within itself, could not the number be reduced? Why organize a new body and call it "the church in action" to fight the temperance battle? It was necessary once. Is it still necessary? But so long as the Protestants of a great metropolitan area leave 35,000 of the neediest people of the city without any ministry, each letting the other undertake this costly and ill-rewarding task, and none of them feeling a sense of mandate concerning it, have we any ground for criticizing the governments for their bungling methods in handling mandates?

Industrialism is obviously too big a matter for any one denomination to tackle single-handed; race likewise. Yet even in our coöperative work, we seem to require jim crow federations.

A positive way to approach race matters is for Protestants to tackle a real job together. For example, the Chicago Federation maintains a Chinese Church, and the Wichita Council a Mexican Chapel. This latter is an interesting example of how a dozen or more denominations, some of them through official benevolence, can unite in the support and management of a work for a people alien to the life of a community until befriended by the Christian citizenship and built into characteristic local habits of life. This church occupies a property worth $15,000.00 which is owned by the Council of Churches. The pastor is a Spanish speaking ordained minister of sufficient ability to be a teacher of conversational Spanish in the local municipal university. He and his family occupy a neat little manse adjoining the church. Thus the council not only helps an underprivileged group, but it has real estate free of debt and of tangible worth in establishing the federation idea on a permanent basis. Of course not all grasp the idea. The question is raised, "Suppose these Mexicans move away. What church membership can they show?" As if membership in a church backed by a dozen denominations were less valid than membership in a church backed by one denomination.

Another tangible evidence of federation work is a weekly newspaper, such as is published by several local federations and by the Ohio Council of Churches. Such projects make the federation idea seem more real.

Of course religious education is as vital a part of all church federation work as it is of the local church. Actually there are two national councils — the Federal Council of Churches, and the International Council of Religious Education. This is of course a historic fact, but it will not remain so. Eventually the irresistible logic of the situation will bring these two councils together as it has the work of church coöperation and religious education in many local fields.

The scope of this work is very large. Beside Sunday-school coördination, there are the newer fields of week day religious education, vacation church schools, community training schools, and the like. The work runs over almost imperceptibly into the character education of the schools; and the Christian Associations are increasingly thinking of themselves in terms of educative processes. In the case of the Y. M. C. A. the problem seems to be how to keep "the arm of the church" at once free and at the same time articulated with the body at the shoulder. In the case of the Y. W. C. A. it must be recognized that that organization definitely sets out to be "inter-confessional." Meanwhile Christian women are finding that church coöperation as such affords them scope for many activities formerly undertaken under undenominational and non-church auspices. The Christian Associations, largely because of the tangible quality of their work and their material equipment, and partly because of the momentum of the years, find it possible to secure from five to ten times as much money from the same people as do the church federations. Will it always be so? Maybe it ought to be.

One wonders why the denominations give such meager support, even though it is increasing, to these great national interdenominational movements, such as the Federal and the International councils. Does American Protestantism have its fingers crossed? Or did the denominations sign these agreements without realizing that representation without taxation is bankruptcy? Or does it mean that the denominations are just plain broke? Are we perchance putting so much money into church buildings that we have not enough left for coöperative enterprises?

Two things seem evident: Parochialism is worse than sectarianism. It is a deeper vice.

And ecclesiastical arithmetic is different from grammar school arithmetic. According to the latter 28 times 1 is 28. According to the former it is only about 27/28th. This can be seen at any interdenominational gathering. Were the same speakers at a denominational gathering they would draw a bigger crowd than at a gathering representative of all the churches. Here is a case where any one of a number of the major parts is really much bigger than the whole.

Federation includes coöperative work in evangelism, missions, and many other fields. The emphasis is on practical unity, on doing things together, on the spirit of good-will and coöperation rather than on structural relationships. Behind the churches stands the church, and the unity of the entire church finds practical expression in spite of wide differences of creed, liturgy, and polity, in the federation movement.

The church federation office in any city or state is the nerve center of the coöperative Protestantism of its field. This is a young movement. The Federal Council itself is only twenty years old, and most of the city and state federations are still younger. It is not a rapidly growing movement. It has been from the outset what the Eastern Orthodox churches would call an "autocephalous" movement. The independence and autonomy of the local groups has proved to be costly. The five year program of the Home Missions Council is bound to strengthen the church federation movement greatly. The determination of the Federal Council to major on extension work during the present quadrennium is bound to have its effect. What is needed now is both behind-the-scenes work with denominational leaders on a national scale, and definite ecclesiastical engineering in the local fields. Such a movement requires the services of an itinerant ecclesiastical mechanic, who understands how city-wide and state-wide machinery operates. Things are constantly getting out of kelter. They need fixing. There must be a fixer. As yet the number of such mechanics is pathetically meager.

This is a restricted movement. It is confined almost wholly to a certain type of homogeneous evangelical Protestantism. Even if church union emerged as a by-product, such union would only be a fractional achievement, and might not be more than a hopeful milepost on the way to larger unity. There is more fellowship now across denominational lines than there is within many denominations. Merely to have one big denomination might not increase the amount of real unity.

Church federation is, as the editor of *The Congregationalist* very shrewdly sees, a road building rather than a trail blazing process. Church federation secretaries, many of them, have the instincts of trail blazers. But they must be well equipped with inhibitions. They must seek to move the whole army forward. They dare not allow themselves to be wiped out by their own barrage. Scouting in no-man's-land is dangerous business if it means being sniped from behind. Often it is necessary to "lead on gently according to the pace of the children."

The vocation of church federation secretaries has enlisted a tiny but serious and courageous group of men and women. As they seek to build a road out into the unknown future they are cheered by the words of the poet who said,

> "We shall not travel by the road we make;
> Ere day by day the sound of many feet
> Be heard upon the stones which now we break,
> We shall be come to where the cross roads meet.

"For us the heat by day, the cold by night,
The inch-slow progress and the heavy load,
And death at last to close the long grim fight
With man and beast and stone; for them the road.

"For them the shade of trees which now we plant,
The safe smooth journey and the final goal,
Yea, birthright in the land of covenant —
For us day labor, travail of the soul.

"And yet the road is ours as never theirs!
Is not one joy on us alone bestowed?
For us, the master-joy, O! Pioneers!
We shall not travel — but we make the road."

Ross W. Sanderson.

THE LARGER PRAYER

At first I prayed for Light:
Could I but see the way,
How gladly, swiftly would I walk
To everlasting day.

And next I prayed for Strength:
That I might tread the road
With firm, unfaltering feet and win
The heaven's serene abode.

And then I asked for Faith:
Could I but trust my God,
I'd live enfolded in his peace,
Though foes were all abroad.

But now I pray for Love:
Deep love to God and man,
A living love that will not fall,
However dark his plan.

And Light and Strength and Faith
Are opening everywhere;
God only waited for me, till
I prayed the larger prayer.

—*Mrs. E. D. Cheney.*

THE COMMUNITY CHURCH

BY REV. CLIFF TITUS

Minister First Community Church of Christ, Joplin, Mo.

THE community church movement in the United States now includes not less than 1600 churches. The Community Church Workers of the United States of America, an organization of individuals interested in community churches, includes many of the outstanding religious leaders of the age. The ministers of community churches are ministers in good standing in many different denominations. The community church movement has been described as "the most significant movement in the church to-day." Many outstanding churches in different denominational fellowships are, in reality, and by their own declarations, community churches. Among these are Dr. Fosdick's church in New York, Dr. Jenkins' church, in Kansas City, and Dr. Ainslie's, in Baltimore.

The community church movement is probably being discussed more widely than any other movement in the church. Therefore, we believe that the community church movement should occupy a very important place in any conference on Christian unity.

Community churches are meeting the problems of the church which are outstanding in every discussion of church life.

1. The problem of community religion, placing emphasis upon community life and linking it up with the church. It is naturally much easier for a community church to be community-wide in its interest than it is for a denominational church.

2. The community church makes it easier to place religion on a personal basis, because its appeal is personal; it can appeal to personal loyalty to Jesus and his program rather than to an ecclesiasticism, or to a denominational loyalty or program of any kind.

3. The community church is in a position to face the problem of missions. This problem is recognized to-day as one that can be solved only by a united church. The community church, with its emphasis upon unity and its actual missionary work in union enterprises, is meeting this problem squarely.

4. It is generally recognized that the religious life of rural and small town communities depends absolutely upon a united church. The community church for the small community seems to be the only solution, as is being borne out by experience.

5. The community church, actually practicing Christian unity as it is, is in a position to preach peace and brotherhood in industry and among nations without apology; it is seeking to lead the way.

6. The community church is a practical demonstration of Christian unity. It is not merely a theory but a proved fact in hundreds of instances. It is a demonstration of unity without conformity; but a unity based on tolerance, freedom of thought, and the open mind. It is proving, in actual practice, that there is no religious reason why Christians should be separated from one another. It is demonstrating that actual, organic unity is not only a desirable dream, but that it can be done; it is being done satisfactorily and successfully in hundreds of instances.

The community church is a reality. While many have said, and possibly are still saying, it cannot be done, the fact remains that it is being done and that it is going to be done more and more.

Our concern should be with the attitude that the denominations and community churches maintain toward each other. The community church necessarily must be undenominational. This does not mean that it is anti-denominational. It is opposed to a system which has served its usefulness, which is out-worn and which, according to the testimony of all religious leaders, is a possible hindrance to the kingdom of God. However, it seeks to preserve all of the good that denominations have contributed to the kingdom. It brings together on a common basis all of these contributions and makes it possible for Christians, regardless of creed, to benefit from them.

Therefore, there should be the most sympathetic understanding between denominational and community church groups. There should be the most cordial coöperation between the denominational secretaries and community church workers. Many communities are demanding community churches. Instead of actually being discouraged by denominational secretaries as has sometimes been true, these communities should receive encouragement and help in getting together. Community church ministers should not be condemned by their denominational brethren for trying to practice the Christian unity in which we all have professed to believe.

It surely is not the contention of this paper that the community church movement is the final and perfect step in Christian unity, but we can say from actual experience and observation that it is a very definite and necessary step in the right direction; if we are to ever have Christian unity we have to begin somewhere. The community church is a beginning that gives an assurance of leading to the ultimate fulfilment of that unity for which our Master prayed.

Cliff Titus.

THE WAY

Each church affirms a different creed,
  Each man has one in mind;
No two will ever be agreed,
  No matter how refined.

Each church proclaims one way of life,
  Each man would take that way;
Not creed, but life, shall end our strife,
  And make us one some day.

—*Chauncey R. Piety.*

THE CATHOLICITY OF CONGREGATIONALISM

BY REV. EDWARD TALLMADGE ROOT, D.D.
Secretary of the State Federation of Massachusetts, Somerville, Mass.

WE have already crossed the great divide. Henceforth, all the streams of Christian thought and life flow toward unity. Reunion is a practical necessity. A divided church cannot conquer a unified world. It is a demand of faith and idealism. Who can truly love Christ and not live to answer his farewell prayer,—"that they may all be one"?

Every branch of the still divided church to-day hears the divine call and begins to make its tentative overtures for reunion. Rome firmly, but wistfully, reasserts her claim that the only road to reunion is acceptance of the papacy. With truer humility and confession of the common need of penitence, the Anglican Church offers the amazingly broad platform of the Lambeth quadrilateral. The Christian world, Rome alone declining, met at Stockholm to consider the practical, and at Lausanne, the ecclesiastical, problems of unity.

But the contribution which one characteristically modern form of church organization can make, has, I think, not yet been adequately stated. The various congregationally organized denominations originated in dissent from established churches, and have had a chance to demonstrate their possibilities only in the United States of America with its complete religious liberty. There they exceed in total membership any other Protestant type. They claim to be a revival of New Testament principles, and, though constituting a small minority in Christendom, are not suffering from any inferiority complex. Nevertheless, with the rest of the church, they are awake to the sin of schism, sympathetically listen to proposals for reunion, and venture their own suggestions. Two bodies, Christians and Disciples of Christ, the latter having had an amazing growth, were organized a century ago to protest against division and offer a basis for unity. The body which has preempted the term "congregational" has not forgotten that it was not a sect but the standing order, established in three New England states, where its early parishes called themselves only "the First Church of Christ."

I.

What, then, is the contribution of congregationalism? In the nature of its organization no one can be authorized to speak for it officially. One who has from youth been an ardent Congregationalist, and yet has had for over twenty years the privilege of working with all denominations, may state what, to him, its fundamental principles seem logically to imply.

Those principles are three: Independency, democracy, and fellowship. Christ said, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Where Christ is, there is the church; his presence gives full ecclesiastical authority. Where the one condition is sincerely fulfilled, no human elements, whether numbers or standing, can add or take away validity. Each congregation of believers is independent, self-governing, and responsible only to Christ.

In each congregation all members are equally kings and priests unto God, for Jesus says, "One is your Master and all ye are brethren." Officers are necessary for order and efficiency, but these are the elected servants of the people, and their authority, whether in administration, sacraments, or the ministry of the word, is only that of representatives of the whole congregation.

But congregationalism is not individualism. It is only where believers in Christ are "gathered together in his name," that he promises to be. It is not a creed that creates the church, but a covenant, uniting its members to him and to each other. It is a covenant to "walk in all his ways, now known or, henceforth, to be made known to you," to "walk with us in fellowship so long as your relation to us shall continue." Its classical prayer is, "God grant that, loving and being loved, serving and being served, blessing and being blessed, we may be fitted by our fellowship here for the more perfect fellowship of the redeemed above!" The great word of congregationalism, therefore, is fellowship. It is not confined to the local congregation. Neighboring congregations recognize each other by asking advice or, at least sympathetic interest, in the calling or dismissal of a pastor, settlement of disputes, or the adoption of new policies. In more permanent associations or voluntary corporations, the churches, jealously guarding their independence, consult and coöperate in common tasks too great for any one congregation, like missions, education, and reforms. For practical purposes the congregationally organized denominations easily hold their own by the side of connectional systems. From national, they are reaching out to international organization, and participate, as easily as the latter type, in interdenominational federations and conferences. They are ceasing to think merely in terms of parishes. They are already nationally-minded. Since "God so loved" nothing less, they sing, "Christ for the *World!*" They have a growing vision of a universal congregation of believers in a unified world.

II.

Like other ecclesiastical theories, these principles have been made the cloak of a bigoted and narrow sectarianism. The self-centered congregation, or an alliance of such congregations, bound together by the conviction: "We alone have the true faith," is as unchristian as the most exclusive established church, without the latter's dignity and historic picturesqueness. "The times of ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent." The congregationally organized churches also are bringing forth fruits unto repentance, and it is timely to point out that sectarianism is inconsistent with their fundamental principles; that these imply the most thorough-going catholicity.

Note the logical implication of independency. If it is true of one group "gathered together" in Christ's name, it is true of all. That essential condition is fulfilled wherever Christ is exalted, whether in the bare Quaker meeting or the cathedral with crucifix, altar, and ritual. Mistakes in organization or creed cannot vitiate sincere love and faith; otherwise no congregation could claim the promise, for none is free from sin and error. The congregationalist may reject national or papal organization; but he cannot consistently deny that within both every truly worshiping congregation is a sister church.

But if Jesus taught, "Ye know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them. * * * Not so shall it be among you!" does not the existence of a hierarchy, claiming that "synod" or "holy father" alone can exercise the authority of Christ on earth, vitiate and destroy the marks of true churches of Christ? Some high-church congregationalists have so held. But modern democracy, in church as in state, is becoming more broad-minded and more ready to recognize the soul of truth in all error. At the first New England Congregational Conference, the key-note address said, "We need more vision and supervision." Supervisor is but the Latin translation of *episcopos.* As the local congregation must have officers, so, just in proportion as the co-operation of congregations grows in magnitude, it requires efficient organization. There may be different forms of administration, but these differences, to the consistent congregationalist, cannot be grounds for refusing fellowship. To him the validity of all rests upon the same ground — the consent of the governed. Whether they have voted for the system or not — and the Catholic Lay Congress of Baltimore frankly admitted that the people for centuries elected the bishops,—it is their will that accepts and so creates all ecclesiastical authority. To us the primacy of the pope and the historic episcopate are baseless fictions. But, if to the congregations of the church universal, freely deciding in the light of past, present, and future, such systematic organization, with constitutional safeguards of Christian democracy at every point, should seem wise, it will not be rejected as contrary to the mind of Christ. And, in the meantime, we can joyfully fellowship all who call and name themselves Christian.

Nor can the congregationalist refuse fellowship because of difference in creed. Not on creeds but on a covenant does the church rest. His system requires intelligence; for, if every member is to share in the worship, work, and government, all must have the maximum education. Congregationalism is the mother of schools and colleges. An intelligent membership cannot refrain from thought about the facts on which religion rests, the most fascinating and challenging known to man. Attempts to interpret and to state interpretations are inevitable. But to the congregationalist, such creeds are not tests but testimonies — not hitching posts but starting posts. Pastor Robinson stated once for all our guiding principle, "God has more truth to break forth from his Word." The historic creeds of Christendom are of historic value; but in the nature of the case none can be final.

"Our little systems have their day;
They have their day and cease to be.
They are but broken lights of thee;
And thou, O Lord, are more than they!"

It is not to the past but to the future that we must look for a full statement of Christian faith. We shall not be "strong to apprehend with all the saints what is the breadth and length and height and depth and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge," until all races of mankind are within the church, each to contribute its peculiar genius — the Chinese his habit of doing what he believes, and the Hindu expressing his thought in philosophical mysticism. In the meantime, we welcome every investigator and every thinker, "proving all things, holding fast that which is good," and with Jesus, saying, "Whosoever shall do the will of my Father who is in heaven, he is my brother and sister and mother."

But the sacraments rather than creeds have been the occasion of schism. On this ground congregationally organized churches themselves have limited fellowship. Some bodies, like the Baptists, whose very principles giving them zeal, loyalty, and rapid growth, have insisted on believers' baptism only, and that by immersion, and consistently refused to admit to communion those who had not followed what was thus held to be Christ's clear command. But even these bodies, while following their own conscience, now perceive that their more fundamental principle requires them to recognize the soul liberty of others; and, increasingly, practice open communion. Still wider and deeper have been the schisms produced by differing theories of the Lord's supper. Each of the two main theories rests on the words of Christ, "This is my body," "this do in remembrance of me." To the one party, a sacramental miracle is vital; to the other, such a conception is contradicted both by sense and reason. The latter finds full spiritual satisfaction in a memorial and symbol; to the former, such an interpretation throws away all that is essential and seems almost a sacrilege. How can two such conflicting usages and theories ever be reconciled? By the personality of him whom both exalt! Is it "mere superstition to hold that the bread has literally become or in itself conveys the actual body? Such it might be were it the body of any other. But Christ's Body? To partake of his flesh and blood — how overpowering the conception! Is it an empty form to regard the act as "a mere memorial"? But who can "remember" him and not be inspired and transformed thereby? The conflicting conceptions meet in him! Both types of worshiping congregations are "gathered in his Name." Can they consistently refuse to recognize and fellowship each other?

III.

Thus, on congregational premises, no differences can divide the disciples of Christ. Despite all, they may be consciously one. Nay, more, they must be one! Independency and democracy permit; fellowship requires it! Fellowship is the very essence of the Christian life. "He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen cannot love God whom he hath not seen!" "We know that we have passed out of death into life because we love the brethren." "In life with you I prove my life in him!" Congregationalism cannot and does not, I repeat, limit this fellowship to the local parish. It has "come unto the city of the living God, * * * to the general assembly and church of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven." It wholeheartedly and joyfully joins in the confession of faith, "I believe in the holy catholic church!"

Such fellowship must, in its nature, be mutual. And across all barriers of difference it already exists. I sat through a two-and-a-half-hour service in a Lutheran church by a Norwegian fjord. The responses read and chanted seemed endless. The clergyman wore the great stiff collar which I had seen only in pictures. He changed his robe from black to white to red, lavishly embroidered, then back to black. Communion was administered; but only five partook, they having previously gone forward for a rite, perhaps unique among Protestants, of absolution. Yet through the mists of a strange language, I knew in whose name that congregation had gathered! A fine copy of Hoffman's Christ in Gethsemane hung above the altar. "Even so, come, Lord Jesus!" was the motto above the chancel. And when the service was over and by signs we obtained permission to return in one of the waiting motor boats, with standing room only, the choir-master's pitch-pipe started new anthems, and while the engine gently purred and we glided over the still waters, the mighty mountains towering half a mile above our heads, echoed back such fitting praises to God as I never expected to hear this side of heaven! They ceased. I took from my pocket a Norwegian Testament and showed it to the leader. His face lighted up. We clasped hands — brothers in Christ!

One Christmas eve, a Roman priest, with whom I had worked for a certain reform measure, called me by telephone to say, "I cannot retire without wishing you a blessing in the name of the Babe of Bethlehem!" Another time he telephoned, "I have a book I want to present to you." It proved to be the sermons of T. Dewitt Talmage. "Have you read these sermons yourself? What do you think of them?" "We agree in most points." We talked of Christian themes for more than an hour. I alluded to our frequent use of Faber's hymns. "Have you ever read his book—*Creature and Creator?* It is a charming work." The next day it came to me with his compliments. It revealed the mind of giver as well as author, in its eloquent descriptions of nature and its love and charity, everywhere true to the spirit of the lines:

> "For the love of God is broader
> Than the measure of man's mind,"

refusing to admit that careless Catholic or even heretic is beyond the circle of that Love.

If there was any qualification in our fellowship, it was due to our underlying consciousness that his ecclesiastical theory excluded me from the true church, in which alone is salvation found. The more credit to his loving heart which treated me as a Christian brother! But I was glad that my theory enabled me to recognize him as such without qualification or reservation. We are both catholics, but congregationalism is the conception which emancipates catholicity!

That this is not an individual experience, that others trained in the congregational theory, are native born citizens of the church universal, is proved by the fact they furnish so large a proportion of the organizers of interdenominational and cosmopolitan movements of our day for practical steps toward unity. So many names occur to my mind that I dare not and need not mention one. In no other ecclesiastical system is it so easy to find men with the breadth, tact, understanding, and sympathy with every type of thought and polity, which are essential to success in such service. They may care less for discussion to reconcile theories; they are foremost in every concrete demonstration of unity to save a perishing world.

This, then, is the meaning of congregationalism,—independency, democracy, and fellowship, these three; and the greatest of these is fellowship! Independency and democracy may have to be harmonized with other principles in the final catholicity; but fellowship must abide as its breath of life!

Only in this atmosphere can there ever come an all-inclusive organization, a common ritual, a concensus of Christian opinion. Other ecclesiastical systems will bring their glory and honor into that coming city of God. But for general acceptance of those contributions we must wait, perhaps long. The distinctive contribution of congregationalism is immediately available. "The kingdom of heaven it at hand!" Real unity is ours the moment we stretch forth the right hand of fellowship to all! And when at last there is one universally accepted ecclesiastical system, a ritual free yet common, harmonious if not uniform interpretation of the divine reality and the sacraments by which we feel his presence, will these agreements add appreciably to the joy which we find in fellowship? May this not be tenderer and deeper because of differences? "When that which is perfect is come" can it be improved or increased? And what is fellowship but love? "Love is of God, and every one that loveth is begotten of God, and knoweth God." "For God is love."

Is all this too high a claim? The characteristic hymn of congregationalism begins:

"Blest be the tie that binds
Our hearts in Christian love!
The fellowship of Christian minds
Is like to that above!"

E. TALLMADGE ROOT.

HOW LOVE RULES AND REIGNS

I say to thee, do thou repeat
To the first man thou mayest meet
In lane, highway or open street —
That he, and we, and all men move
Under a canopy of love,
As broad as the blue sky above.
And ere thou leave him, say thou this,
Yet one word more — they only miss
The winning of the final bliss
Who will not count it true that love,
Blessing, not cursing, rules above,
And that in it we live and move.

—*R. C. Trench.*

LIBERTY AND CORPORATE FELLOWSHIP: THE KEYNOTE OF THE UNITED CHURCH

BY PRINCIPAL W. ROBINSON, M. A.
Overdale College, Birmingham, England

THERE is a strange dichotomy observed in the writings of St. Paul, which to little minds who dearly love consistency, is very embarrassing. It is the double emphasis on *liberty* and on *order*. Sometimes the great apostle seems to be an arrant individualist, and at other times a convinced institutionalist. It is chiefly in his earlier epistles—Romans and Galatians—that the former attitude is stressed, and in his later epistles—Colossians, Ephesians, and the pastorals—that the latter attitude finds clearest expression. So conflicting do the two attitudes seem to be on a cursory reading, that early New Testament critics declared that the two sets of writings could not have come from the same man (a position which is now no longer held by sane critics, and one which was based upon a too narrow ideal of consistency, and upon a faulty psychological insight).

But all down the ages the dichotomy has given rise to varying estimates of Paul, best illustrated by two modern Protestant writers. Professor C. H. Dodd of Oxford finds in Paul the champion of those who can never satisfy themselves with institutional religion; while Bousset, the great continental scholar, thought of Paul as the very founder of Christian institutionalism! Undoubtedly in Paul there are to be found both the emphasis on liberty and the emphasis on authority in a certain sense.

But the trouble is that all down the ages Paul has been largely misunderstood so far as his doctrine of the church is concerned. We have only to read the works of his immediate successors, such as Clement of Rome, Papias, Justin Martyr, and Ignatius to see how very far the spiritual thermometer, which stands so high in the Pauline writings, had really fallen a generation or two later. In their literal sense the words of Paul might be honored, but in their true spiritual meaning they were little understood. It is true, as George Eliot has said, that we never really understand the words of a truly great man until we have learned to share, in some measure, the experiences out of which they grew.

This is nowhere better illustrated than in the writings of the second century, which seek to interpret for the church the mind of Paul. It was one thing for Paul to speak of "coming with a rod," but it is quite another thing—and a dangerous thing—for lesser men than Paul to follow his example. By the close of the second century, especially in the west, the church had—largely due to the pressure of heretical sects, but partly because there were no minds big enough to grasp the true essentials in Paul's teaching—become thoroughly legalized and defended by rigid bulwarks of creed, sacred canon of Scripture, and ordered hierarchy of ministry. So the unity of the institution was safeguarded, and within the next four centuries—again under the pressure of heresy—all this was crystallizing and hardening, until it appears in the fully developed Roman system, with its centralized organ of authority.

Yet, for another thousand years, there was some measure of liberty, and the popes were by no means masters in their own house. The Middle Ages, with its theological and philosophical disputants is sufficient witness to this. The Reformation, however, further helped the hardening process, and from this experience Rome emerged—in reaction to what she regarded as Protestant heresies—as a closed system, an institution wherein was the minimum of liberty in the domains of thought and morality, in other words in the field of personality. Rome was henceforth—if she thought at all—to think corporately, not in the sense which Paul had stressed of each member contributing to the corporate result, but in the sense that she was to have a special organ of thought—the infallible pope (really and truly the Roman curia). This, in effect, meant that she was, in the main, to think in a circle. This is not to say that there have not been great thinkers in the Roman communion—one remembers with gratitude Baron von Hügel — but the position of such thinkers has always been precarious as was illustrated in the cases of Tyrrell and Loisy.

Now the Protestant churches at the Reformation, largely followed the example of Rome, and sought to preserve their unity by a legalized interpretation of Christianity, set forth in various creeds and confessions like those of Westminster, Augsburg, and the Thirty-nine Articles. Erasmus, though he remained a faithful son of Rome, had warned men in his day that "by identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance"; but in spite of this warning the creed makers of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries pursued their task of interpreting the Christian facts in the thought terms of their own day, and thus largely denied to the church of the future the right to think outside these categories.

But all this ultra institutionalism is a misunderstanding of Paul's thought, and of the fundamental nature of personality too, especially as regards corporate relationships. Paul is neither a libertarian, in the sense of advocating complete freedom of thought and action for every individual, nor is he a rigid institutionalist in the sense of regarding the church as a mechanical thing with rules and regulations of a legalized nature. Laws there may be, but they are not of the arbitrary kind; they are those kind of laws which are fundamental to personality itself in its human relationships. Such is the law of love. Paul's view of the church is that of an organism—not a machine—a body, capable of growth and development. It is that of a fellowship society—a divine society; for, let it be said, Paul's view is a *high* view—whose keynote is *corporate loyalty,* and not legalized discipline; whose bond is *love* and not authority in the usually accepted sense. Those who rule are, indeed, those who *have become the bondslaves of all.* Individualism—where every man is a law unto himself, and every immature thinker is a prophet and a leader selling new lamps for old, and asserting that "he speaks in the name of the morality of the future," when, indeed, he has neither experience of life nor understanding—may, indeed, be a truly ugly thing, perhaps far more ugly than a regimented, legalized, authoritarian institution.

But St. Paul's thought had room for neither. He saw in a religion which based itself on personality — for such was Christianity — the possibility of a church which transcended both, at once the home of freedom and of loyalty; for the soul needs both freedom and loyalty for its highest development. In fact, freedom is loyalty, and loyalty is freedom. He is most free who is most loyal, providing he chooses a loyalty which is big enough for freedom to develop in, and so further deepen his loyalty. In other words loyalty is the only atmosphere in which freedom can work. As Josiah Royce said, "In loyalty, when loyalty is properly defined, is the fulfilment of the whole moral law."

It was in the early years of the nineteenth century, when Christianity in all its forms was thoroughly creed-bound and legalized in its expression (apart from Quakers and Unitarians, though Unitarians often had a rigid negative creed); or on the other hand was thoroughly anarchical in the strange sects which multiplied, that a movement began simultaneously in America and the British Isles. This movement set itself the paradoxical task of freeing the church from legalistic and authoritarian institutionalism on the one hand, and from anarchical individualism on the other. It had for its prophets such men as William Jones, M.A., of London, and Alexander Campbell, Walter Scott, and Barton W. Stone in America. It was finally forced, against its will, into denominational expression, and is represented to-day by Disciples in America and by Churches of Christ in Great Britain and her colonies.

Now Disciples have ever pleaded for the unity of the church, but they have preferred to rest their whole case for unity upon the Pauline basis of liberty and corporate loyalty. They have not felt that loyalty is best preserved in the Body by legalized methods of setting up infallible standards in credalized forms. They have preferred to walk within a garden without such clearly defined fences, one which might even open on to the moors and waste places, knowing that should any consciously or unconsciously stray out into the wild, hunger would bring them back to the plentifully supplied garden, and that the loss of color and scent, which, once in the waste places, was theirs no longer, would produce its own heart-ache and consequent retracing of their footsteps. Or to change the metaphor they have preferred to ask Christians to live dangerously; and so they have demanded of those who came to baptism, no assent to written creeds enshrining theological dogmas, but simply an *oath of allegiance* to Jesus as Lord.

They have sought to secure a personal basis for love working itself out in loyalty to Jesus and to the corporate society which is his Body, the church; and to stress the fact that to be a traitor to such a loyalty, based and founded in love, is a more heinous sin than to be a little muddle-headed on some theological explanation of a fact of experience. Like Father Tyrrell, the founders of the movement made a distinction between "dogma" as a fact of Christian experience, and "theology" as an explanation of Christian facts in language suited to the thought of a single age. And it is a striking testimony to the value of this distinction, that the great Christian facts of the fatherhood of God, the deity and perfect humanity of Jesus Christ, his redeeming work for mankind, and the indwelling of the holy Spirit have been tenaciously held without theological creeds playing any part at all in conserving unity. As in the early church, the unity has been a unity of life based upon a mystical experience of these great facts of our common faith. Churches of Christ use only the baptismal confession which makes the Person of Jesus central and is really an *oath of allegiance* to him. In this they have been helped by their emphasis on baptism and the Lord's supper; their loyalty to these two sacraments, and to the idea of the one Body, there can be little doubt; for dogma is best enshrined in dramatic form, better transmitted by art than by logical definition.

All this, of course, has not always been equally well maintained. The early teachers a century ago had few or no followers of equal intellectual grasp, and certainly few of the same spiritual stature. There were many who sought to set up unwritten creeds more rigid in their demands than written ones. Sometimes they have seemed even to dominate the churches and to cramp their life and imprison it within the narrowest possible compass, hedging it round by infallible barriers as rigid as those of Rome. But such have never understood the real genius of the movement to which they have belonged, and, so far as I know, have never succeeded in gaining a single conviction for heresy, largely because on a basis of liberty and a free fellowship in love, corporate loyalty has been maintained at a maximum and real heresies have not appeared. And further on the truly personal basis of liberty and corporate loyalty, whilst there will be no sympathy with opinions which definitely undermine Christian faith and morals, it will be realized that any real authority which can deal with their rejection must depend upon a free and not a managed consensus.

I trust that no one will conclude that this is written in disparagement of theology, nor in disparagement of any adequate philosophy of the Christian faith. Quite the opposite is the case. There must be within the church the fullest room for theological and philosophical advancement. But just for this very reason the church must not lend herself to, nor base her unity upon, the philosophy or theology of any one age. She must base it upon something deeper and more abiding. Neither do I wish to deny that creeds—statements of Christian belief—may have their use and have had all down the ages, some being much more permanent than others. But they have been permanent in the degree in which they have confined themselves to "dogma" in Tyrrell's sense, rather than to "theology," and, in any case, they are not the best safeguards of the church's unity. They have their limits. But the oath of *loyalty* has no such limits. To take him as both Lord and Christ is to set out on a task which can find its consummation only when we reach him and are like him—when we see him as he is.

W. ROBINSON.

Birmingham, England.

THE ORDER OF ANTIOCH

BY REV. FREDERIC E. J. LLOYD

Primate of the American Catholic Church, Chicago

In Antioch the disciples of Christ were first called Christians. By the ministrations of St. Paul the apostle in Antioch the door of entrance into the Christian hope and promise was first opened. Later, by the aged Ignatius, saint and martyr and patriarch of Antioch, the religion of Christ, it is said, was first called "Catholic." Catholic and Christian became convertible terms, they were one and one only. There was complete unity between all the Christians of Antioch and, indeed, among those of regions scattered far and wide from that illustrious city.

These Antiochean Christians held the faith of the gospel of Christ Jesus and, because they held it in common, they were always in communion each with the other. There were no divisions. In the divisions to-day it must be because the dividers do not understand what the gospel is. The gospel is essentially a healer not a divider, and a spiritual unifier. Thus, because Christians of ages subsequent to the first age of Christianity have not fully believed the blessed gospel, as they who first received it, grievous havoc has been wrought between Christians, since communion and unity, the first mark of early Christianity, can nowhere be found.

This disturbing fact being admitted, the good Christian will not content himself with tears or even prayers in seeking a remedy. He will bestir himself to reëstablish the lost unity and communion, so true and precious as they were to the Christians in Antioch and elsewhere.

The narrow, obstinate, I had almost said churlish, character of some modern denominationalists marks an entirely new thing in disruptive religion, a thing which makes for war, not for peace. It would seem, at times, that, for the sake of denominationalism, we are ready to sacrifice Christianity itself. In certain quarters there can be small doubt that this divisive force is hard at work in such business. And if it may not be discredited by good men and true, then it should be made ridiculous.

If external divisions cannot be blotted out, and of this there appears but slight evidence, then a potency must be placed within them which shall burn, like the chaff they are, that which provokes and sustains them, and fuse good men in all such divisions into a compact unity which cannot, because it will not, be destroyed.

Holding with a celtic tenacity to what I take to be the fundamental teaching of the undivided church, with a love for the beautiful and orderly in religious ceremonies, combined with a deep reverence for tradition, not overlooking their implications, nevertheless if we cannot associate the good, the true, and the beautiful in an indivisible unity, Catholicism and Protestantism must give place to Christianity—by this I mean that narrow, bitter norm of Catholicism and Protestantism so prevalent to-day. Christ Jesus existed before his church. Nevertheless, his church was organized love, whatever else, in his divine purpose it might be. It was never meant to be an agent both productive and provocative of strife and division, not merely ecclesiastical, but also social, as it has grown to be. Not only is denomination arrayed against denomination and sect against sect, but society, as is well-known, is set against society, even down to the social life of the individual. Surely such an organization, even though it pass under the name of the Christian church, cannot by any stretch of thought be held harmonious with the mind of our blessed Lord whose latest appeal to his divine Father was for unity, that the world could not fail to recognize it. The early followers of our Lord, we are told, had all things in common, in other words, in communion, including even the highest the holiest of his gifts, as sacrament and sacramental meal. He was revealed to the two on the way to Emmaus by the breaking of the bread, so surely may his children be known by the same sign and token. Such self-revelation as the eating of a common meal demonstrates, is confined exclusively to this quite natural act. Christ is completely revealed to his children and they to each other, when they break holy bread together at the one table, and in so emphatic and real a manner as to leave no room for doubt.

God forbid that we should add yet another to the "Babel of the sects" amid which we live. Nor shall we. In the summer of last year, I was privileged to launch the order of Antioch in London, with the surprising result that I admitted to this order thirteen Christian men and women, all of whom were members of the church of England, and aflame with zeal for Christian unity. Subsequent to my visit and work, others, of good place and position, hearing of the order of Antioch, have been admitted to it, the latest being a very well known and highly esteemed Congregational minister who recognizes the order as a true solvent of our problems concerning that unity for which we strive among believers in and followers of the same Lord Christ. And now there comes a call from another leading Congregational minister in Pennsylvania asking to be taken in, together with many others — all indeed who know of its aims and plans, so that, at last, a oneness may be attained, and of such a nature that there could never be the least temptation to drop out. Once the order of Antioch becomes universally known, it will be universally recognized as the best way yet to reach the unity for which we pray and labor. Thus, in every single denomination we shall, bye and bye, have a center composed of members of the order of Antioch, who, by zeal and the knowledge necessary to moderate and guide it, will destroy the spirit of sectarianism root and branch; and, lo, at a given call and time, from every sect of Christians, there will arise and respond men and women who are brothers and sisters in Christ, not because they are sectaries, whatever name they carry; but because they are of the order of Antioch whose outlook and whose purpose are beyond and outside of anything in the nature of disruptive or disrupted Christianity. With indisputable claims to the very best in tradition and history, we do become really one, to the ultimate and complete discomfiture of denominationalism and its abominable consequences and, moreover, beyond the reach of question of validity from whatever quarter it may arise.

FREDERIC E. J. LLOYD.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

The Diocesan Council of Virginia Favor the Reconciliation Pact

At the meeting of the 134th annual session of the Diocesan Council of the Episcopal Church the Rev. Beverley D. Tucker, Jr., D.D., rector of St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, offered a resolution having for its purpose the furtherance of greater unity and the obliteration of non-essential doctrinal and formal differences that have formerly separated the various branches of the Christian church. The resolution was based upon the Reconciliation Pact among the churches, having sixty-four signers from fifteen denominations. The resolution, following the pact, was as follows:

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, That this council does hereby express its sympathy with the pact of reconciliation among Christians, and gives its cordial approval to the spirit of the pact." It was carried by a vote of 59 to 40.

[From the Richmond (Va.) *News Leader.*]

Merger of Young People's Societies

"We urge upon those denominations whose view of the church prevents immediate organization the continuance of conference on the points which divided them and the largest possible coöperation in these practical methods which do not involve the theory of the church.

"Development of the community church movement, formation of state federations of churches, consolidation of religious journals, new experiments in coöperation among churches, extension of coöperation in religious education and introduction of study of church unity in theological seminaries.

Merger of young people's societies, such as Christian Endeavor, Epworth League, Luther League and Baptist Young People's Union."

[From the Findings of the Christian Herald Institute of Religion at the Buck Hill Falls Conference, Pa.]

The Church of Christ in China

One of the most remarkable of all the present movements toward church union has been taking place in China. In 1927 some sixteen church groups — consisting of Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Baptists, Swedish, Evangelicals, and United Brethren — representing English, Scottish, Irish, Canadian, New Zealand, and American missions, formed themselves into the Church of Christ in China. The general form of organization is along the lines of The United Church of Canada, but the local church is allowed a large degree of autonomy regarding government, so that it may be presbyterian or congregational, or even episcopal in form if so desired.

[From *The New Outlook,* Toronto, Canada.]

Christian Unity in the Philippines

The formation of "The United Evangelical Church of the Philippines" by the union of the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and United Brethren is in line with the tradition of coöperation and comity which was established soon after American religious forces began work in the islands. It was there and then, for the first time on any considerable scale or under any carefully drawn plan, that denominations agreed upon an allocation of missionary fields. Efforts to promote a more perfect union have occurred intermittently during the last fifteen years. One fruit of these efforts has been the Union theological seminary in Manila. The fact that the work of the three denominations which are now entering into a union is in different fields simplifies the actual process of unification. The Congregationalists of Mindanao become "the Mindanao conference of the United Evangelical church in the Philippines"; the Presbyterian mission becomes "the Manila conference of the United Evangelical church"; the United Brethren in northern Luzon are "the Northern Luzon conference of the United Evangelical church." The forms of organization will be gradually assimilated to a pattern agreed upon as meeting the actual needs of the situation and sacrificing nothing that any of the coöperating bodies regard as essential. With such a nucleus, a still more comprehensive united church in the Philippines may be an achievement of the not distant future.

[From *The Christian Century,* Chicago.]

LETTERS AND COMMENTS

Clearing Up Misunderstandings

To the Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly.*

Dear Sir:—The prevalent yearning for Christian unity should be sedulously fostered, though the efforts to attain it, so far, have not had marked success. Interdenominational conferences cannot of themselves establish unity, for they cannot control their constituencies. The council of Florence in 1438, at which assisted the Greek emperor, the patriarch of Constantinople, and a number of Eastern prelates, carefully smoothed out every difference, unanimously agreed to an organic union with the Latin church, and sang the *Te Deum* over the happy result; but the constituencies of the Greek leaders refused to unite.

After referring to the recent peace pact for a union of nations and the outlawry of war, Dr. Peter Ainslie asks whether the churches will continue their "amazing contentment in their isolation." Further efforts for religious unity could be patterned after the famous peace pact by which nations agree that "the solution of disputes . . . shall never be sought except by pacific means." This, translated into ecclesiastical language, means that participants in interdenominational conferences would be free to discuss non-essentials of creeds, or historic aspect of essentials, but should not deny, attack, or discuss each other's fundamental or essential points of belief. Provision could be made for clear statements of essential points of faith when called for, and for corrections of outstanding false public statements in regard to them. Such straightforward statements would clear up thick mists and sinister misunderstandings now blocking the path to unity. There is, for instance, a widespread false impression that the Catholic belief in the pope's infallibility means his impeccability, or infallibility in his personal opinions.

Fundamental points of faith have historic aspects which should be open to discussion. The Catholic dogma, for instance, that God has endowed human beings with the gift of free will, and that human acts spring from the deliberate free will of the individual, entails historic questions as to religious wars having interfered with the exercise of the free will, and the prevention of similar calamities in future. The most deep-seated religious differences are rooted in the heart rather than the mind, and are founded on national, personal, ancestral, or inherited grievances, which need clearing up, rather than on points of faith, which people seem to be more and more weary to discuss. Interdenominational conferences should be free to discuss nonessentials, such as disciplinary regulations, liturgical language changes, effects of the temporal power of the pope on Italian preponderance in the purely religious government of the church, the effect of such preponderance on centralization of authority, etc.

It may be asked: How can any conference promote unity without discussing fundamentals? After saying that the representatives of the new Vatican state will be in a position to do much for the establishment of universal peace, Dr. Frederick Lynch, in the last issue of *The Christian Union Quarterly*, furnishes the answer:

"Catholics and Protestants will be working together for the same big ends, and that is the great thing. Understanding will come out of it, and with understanding, suspicions and fears disappear, the differences fade out of consciousness, and the similarities emerge and stand out. The feeling of oneness always emerges in any group of divergent faiths when for a considerable time and ardently they confer together on work in any great cause. . . . It is amazing how little association there has been of Catholics and Protestants even in Europe."

GEORGE ZURCHER
Pastor of St. Vincent's Catholic Church,
North Evans, N. Y.

Dr. O. E. Goddard on Christian Unity at the Vanderbilt Rural Church School

To the Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly.*

Dear Sir:—I wish to call your attention to the influence of Vanderbilt University School of Religion in behalf of Christian unity. It enrolled this year 360 pastors from 26 denominations and 22 states, all of them from the open country or towns of less than 2500 population. Among the speakers on the program this year were Dr. O. E. Goddard, foreign missionary secretary of the M. E. Church South; Dr. W. R. King of the Home Mission Council; Dr. Alva W. Taylor; Bishop H. L. Smith of India; Dr. S. M. Cavert; Dr. W. W. Alexander; and Dr. H. N. Morse. I am sending you a brief of Dr. Goddard's sermon.

J. MITCHELL HOYE.

Woodstock, Va.

Dr. Goddard said: "Rudyard Kipling was right when he said that one of the chief difficulties of the human mind was its inability to keep primary things as primary and secondary things as secondary. To keep principal things as principal and subordinate things as subordinate. To keep consequential things as consequential and inconsequential things in the realm of inconsequential. If the human family had been able to do this human history would have been vastly different. Troubles galore have arisen in the political world, in the commercial world, and in the domestic circle by reason of man's inability to keep matters properly classified. The common sin is to push secondary things up into the realm of primary things and thus cause trouble and confusion. But the most prolific source of trouble has been in the realm of religion in the history of the Christian church. God only knows how much conflict, contests, contention, controversy, and even war have been brought about by over emphasis of non-essential matters in the church. Forms, creeds, rituals, ceremonies, sacraments, have all been obtruded into the realm of essentials and placed on a par with Christ. Undue emphasis on these externals necessarily obscures the Christ. If Christ is preëminent, none of these things can be preëminent. If Christ can be kept in his proper place in our thinking, the Christian forces of the world could get together in some way so as to deliver themselves with one solid impact on the world, the flesh, and the devil. This is the desideratum of the times. It is a consummation devoutly to be desired.

"Paul is perhaps the finest example in Christian history of a man who kept primary things as primary and secondary things as secondary. From the inception of his experience of Christ on the Damascus road until his head went off in Rome, Christ was preëminent in his life and thought. Moreover Christ loomed larger and larger with the passing of the years. Christ occupied a larger place in his thinking in the epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians and Philippians than he did when I and II Thessalonians were written. I have often wished that those in the long ago who arranged the books of the Bible might have been able to have placed the Pauline epistles in chronological order. Had they done so even the casual reader could have seen this development in Paul's experience. As Christ emerged more and more in his experience, things receded correspondingly. In the last years of his life, ripe in years and rich in experience, Christ filled the whole horizon. The all sufficient Christ filled all in all. He was in all, over all, above all. He saw but little except Christ and him crucified, risen, and alive forevermore.

"Paul's experience is the proper, normal experience for every Christian. Christ should be central in the very beginning. He should loom larger and larger with the passing of the years until he fills the whole horizon. The pity is that we have had so much arrested development. So many millions have not availed themselves of the means of growth and have been dwarfed. We have more cases of arrested development in spiritual life than in physical life. This accounts for the contention about unimportant matters. Undue concern about non-essential matters is indicative of immaturity in Christian experience. Let that be repeated with emphasis. *Undue concern about non-essentials is indicative of immaturity in Christian experience.*

"Christ is preëminent in all the *means* by which we grow into full grown men and women in the Lord. He is preëminent in the Bible. All that is worthwhile in the Old Testament points to Christ. The prophecies, the ceremonies, the sacrifices, are all so many indices pointing to the coming of Christ. The whole history is but an unfolding of God's plan to bring a Redeemer into this world. Preaching puts Christ preëminent, that is, if it is real preaching. Our sole business as preachers is to hold up Christ as the only hope of a lost world. He is the most attractive subject. He is the most majestic, the most magnetic, the most colossal figure of the ages. ''Tis all my business here below to cry behold the Lamb.'

"In the calendar of the civilized world Christ is preëminent. Every legal paper in the world recognizes the preëminence of Christ. The great focal date of history was the day of his advent to this world. All before that is B.C. and all subsequent to that is A.D. All religious helps and some civil and political faces help us to make Christ preëminent. The hope of unification of Christianity lies in making Christ preëminent. If all denominations could put him first, make him preëminent, the minor matters would not loom so large. When the peerless Christ fills the horizon, subordinate matters naturally take their subordinate place. Perhaps the matter of largest concern in the Christian world to-day is unification of believers. Most commendable efforts are being made, notably in Canada, for merging denominations. Federations are being formed all over the Christian world. Our hope of final unification lies in this larger realm. We cannot agree on the non-essentials. We are hopelessly apart on ritual and sacraments. But all can agree on putting Christ preëminent. When this agreement is fixed and begins to register itself in a practical way the difficulties in the way of a unified Christendom will not seem to be so insuperable.

"Putting Christ preëminent will also immensely accelerate the foreign missionary program. Discerning orientals have discovered the difference between our civilization and the teachings of Jesus. They are now saying we want Christ but we don't want western civilization. Christ preëminent in our churches and in our civilization would render that objection futile. But so long as we magnify minor matters it is valid. Make Christ preëminent and it will unify Christendom and so relate the Christian forces of the world that they can present a solid front to the non-Christian world and bring them to his feet. So may it be."

BOOK REVIEWS

IF I COULD PREACH JUST ONCE. New York and London: Harper and Brothers; pages 255; price $2.50.

This book will be widely read. The publishers announce it as the "first edition," intimating that there will be other editions. And there will be. Here are thirteen distinguished laymen with a range of thought that is as wide as present day thinking will permit in the romantic range of the human mind. It sweeps from orthodox religion to such humanitarian philosophy that accepts only the divine spark which is called the spirit of man. The thirteen contributors have their faces turned toward making a better world. John Drinkwater would emphasize "the power of the word"—just plain words that we speak. They make for peace or the opposite, his closing quotation being, "But I say unto you, that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give an account thereof in the day of judgment." Ludwig Lewisohn discusses justice, truth, and peace from a quotation from Talmudic literature. He maintains that there are "no new ethics under the sun; there is no new road to human salvation." Science, he says, cannot make men merciful. On the contrary, it puts into the hands of the pagan instruments of death, leaving "salvation as far off as ever." He appeals "to Jewish ethics, that is to say, to Christian ethics untainted by pagan psychology, by its excesses, by its lust for superiority and power." He discusses war, fear, and the rage of the pagan heart against justice, truth, and peace upon which the hope of the world rests.

Sir Philip Gibbs discusses "the unknown future." War and scientific discovery have broken down the old framework of human thought making a definite break with the past. Civilization does not survive the downfall of its gods. "Its doom is declared when the faith and idealism which formed the basis of its laws, the inspiration of its art, and the meaning of its life are challenged by skepticism, and then abandoned in disbelief. Some other and better civilization may take its place, or it may lie buried and forgotten in jungles where its ancient monuments are hidden in its undergrowth." The conflict is already on between those who believe in spiritual values and those who deny them. "Our faith to-day will make the history of tomorrow." Hence let us love laughter, tolerance, and good-fellowship.

G. K. Chesterton finds the root of evil in pride and he sees in the Catholic Church the salt and preservation of all that makes for humility. Dr. Henry Noble MacCracken sees youth laying hold of life, by which knowledge, justice, righteousness, fame or honor are but shadows. Lord Hugh Cecil finds that the most important thing is to become a Christian, experienced and practiced, seeing in the coming of Christ the greatest event in history. Dr. Sheila Kaye-Smith has an appropriate word for "the bishops and the clergy" on the deterioration of the sermon, which ought to instruct the mind and stir the emotions, whereas it is more frequently "a mere tinkling of the ears." She sees in the greatness of the demand the deterioration of the supply, so that the modern sermon is little more than "a sort of moral lecturette." She advocates special series, on the university plan, at a central place by a specially qualified preacher, apart from any service, and drawing a congregation from those who have already fulfilled their obligation of worship elsewhere.

Dr. Henry Seidel Canby emphasizes "the importance of style," because he sees that all qualifications aside, the English Bible, and especially the King James version, is losing or has lost, a power over the imagination almost unexampled in history. He contends that we must recapture the word, "while secondary if you will, and an instrument only, is indispensible for turning ideas and emotions into communicable force." Sir A. Conan Doyle goes "behind the veil of death" and discusses the nature of psychic knowledge, which he regards as the most important event since the raising of the ethical standards associated with Jesus. Prof. J. Arthur Thomson discusses "the three voices of Nature," corresponding to man's threefold relation to nature — practical, emotional and intellectual. The three voices are endeavor, enjoy, and inquire; or, at another pitch, struggle, revere, and search.

Sir Thomas Horder discusses morals and health, waging war, as every physician must do, he says, against premature death, against disability, and against pain. To live long, he says, depends chiefly upon our forebears; to live healthily depends chiefly upon ourselves. "Jesus taught a fundamental lesson in mental hygiene when he bade us live one day at a time"— equanimity. Hon. Bertrand Russel discusses the elimination of fear, which he regards as having been inculcated chiefly by parents, priests, and governments in order to maintain authority instead of appealing to reason. The last chapter is by Dr. Joseph Collins, who discusses "the road to redemption," emphasizing self-realization as the road for the saving of a man's soul. He discusses sin, ignorance, and fear and contends for a religion that is practicable, and that is in conformity with science, rather than with tradition.

This book opens to the reader the innermost thoughts of thirteen leading figures in science, statesmanship, education and literature. One may dissent from many things in it, but every chapter teems with thought provoking sentences — keen, fresh and practicable.

PROTESTANTISM IN THE UNITED STATES. By Archer B. Bass, A.M., Th.D. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company; pages 364; price $3.00.

153 white Protestant denominations in the United States! This, of course, does not include the 19 negro Protestant denominations, following in the footsteps of the whites, and the 43 other denominations that are not Protestant. As one reads over this long list, he cannot help wondering, What are their peculiarities? Take for instance the Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestinarian Baptists. We have not the slightest idea what two-seed-in-the-Spirit means, but it must be something very vital. Nevertheless it is encouraging to note that in 1916 they had 48 churches, while in 1926 they had only 27 churches. Or the Primitive Friends, who had 2 churches in 1916; in 1926 they had been reduced to 1. But there must be other processes set up other than disintegration. In spite of all its great figures and wealth if Protestantism does not get together it will perish.

This book treats of the European background of Protestantism including the rise of the Reformation, breaking up into Protestant sects, sectarian spirit manifested in creed-making, and sectarian spirit deepened by suffering; it further treats of the rise of Protestant denominations in the United States, those imported from Europe and those that are native to America. The Lord's supper, baptism, the seventh day, the second coming, church polity, interpretations of the Bible, human slavery, and even search for unity became factions for division. Mr. Bass says, "A strange irony of fate decreed that the search for unity among existing denominations should give rise to six new Protestant sects — three in fact and three in entirety." These are the Church of the New Jerusalem, Disciples, Christians, the Apostolic Church, the Church of God in Christ, and the Non-Sectarian Church of Bible Faith.

While it is difficult to see any advantage in all this multiplicity of divisions, yet the author regards the evil not without some good, and thinks that it gave exaltation to the Bible, which, however, we doubt very much, and religious liberties, which likewise must pass under new interpretation. But over against all this, including denominational education, Mr. Bass sees that the evil of division was in the loss of spiritual fellowship, overlapping of work and workers, leaving to this day the gravest problem in the history of Protestantism.

The second section of the book deals with interdenominationalism in the United States; its problem and progress. This is extremely interesting. While there are 153 white Protestant denominations, he regards the major work of Protestants as confined largely to the following fourteen denominations: Northern Baptists, Southern Baptists, Congregationalists, Disciples, Northern Methodists, Southern Methodists, Northern Presbyterians, Southern Presbyterians, United Presbyterians, Cumberland Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Reformed in America, Reformed in the United States, and the United Brethren. He might have added the Lutherans to this list. "Of the 40,000,000 or more Protestant Christians in the country, these fourteen bodies embrace about 20,000,000, or, in other words, over half of all Protestant Christians belong to ten per cent of the Protestant divisions, leaving less than one-half to belong to the remaining nine-tenths of all the denominations." He discusses the missionary problem, both home and foreign, the various types of the community church and makes record of some notable achievements, also union of family groups, the World Conference on Faith and Order, the Federal Council and movements of undenominational character, such as the Evangelical Alliance, American Bible Society, American Tract Society, Y.M.C.A., Y.W.C.A. and so forth.

The last chapter, training for coöperation, is, perhaps, the best in the book, dealing with overcoming past training, offset to sectarian pride, emphasis on points of likeness, inescapable similarities, necessity of propaganda, and closing with a prayer for the unity of all the followers of Christ. The appendix contains much valuable data. It is a book that indicates careful study and looks hopefully to the future.

THE DILEMMA OF PROTESTANTISM. By William E. Hammond, author of *A Permanent Faith: A New Approach*. New York and London: Harper and Brothers; pages 150; price $2.00.

That Protestantism is at the cross roads is becoming evident to all students of religious affairs. Rosy outlook by ecclesiastical officialism and facts do not run very much in accord. Protestants must face these facts. Mr. Hammond has done some thinking and he talks right out from the shoulder. The Bible as a rule of faith, the right of private judgment, and justification by faith — these were the rallying-cry of the Reformation and they have determined the character of the Protestant churches. The purpose of this book is to ascertain whether the emphasis of these principles, as essentially vital and fundamental, is vindicated by modern American Protestantism, whether they are sufficiently potent to preserve Protestantism for the future, or whether the superstructure of future Protestantism must rest on other foundations.

In consequence of Protestant emphasis on the Bible, there arose questions of historicity, authorship, symbolism, ethical values, and religious conceptions, which were followed by the advent of archæology and comparative religion. These helped to discredit the authority of the Bible. As for the principles of private judgment, he says that in its application it "has made for religious irresponsibility and moral laxity." And "the right of private judgment, procured at stupendous sacrifice and suffering, has for hosts of Protestants lost its original moral and spiritual content as to provide sanction for all manner of unsocial conduct, irresponsibility and unbridled license, much to the danger of civilization." Justification by faith has gone so far as to make religion unceasingly a private affair, so that Protestants are very lax in church attendance. While liberty, cultural advantages, and innumerable benefits which science has made possible are due to the Protestant message, nevertheless the deplorable number of Protestant denominations "creates an impression of bewilderment, if not of absurdity."

His chapter on liberalizing religion is particularly wholesome, looking for "a synthesis of faith, out of which will emerge an evangelism that shall prove as potent as any evangel of bygone days in its appeal both to intelligence and the conscience of the age." What critics say of the church, competing organizations, and where authority ultimately rests are the titles of three chapters. In the last instance he sees the chief authority for the regulation of conduct in religious consciousness. After discussing human values, which are tending toward religious conscience, he devotes his last chapter to the way out of the dilemma, which is "the application of Jesus' principles of love to every phase of human endeavor and relationship." It involves stern discipline and "discipline in turn exacts, among other things, patience, endurance, sacrifice, and, not infrequently, suffering." This is a book of courage and hope, well written, reads easily, and is convincing.

THE MASTER — A Life of Jesus Christ. By Walter Russell Bowie, Rector of Grace Church in the City of New York, and formerly Rector of St. Paul's Church, Richmond, Va. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; pages 328; price $2.50.

This book attempts to create a portrait of Jesus rather than being a commentary on his life. It seeks "to portray the face and form of Jesus according to the truth." Each stroke in the picture is reflected from the surest scholarship. A multitude of books have been written on Jesus, but there is always a place for another. Dr. Bowie makes for his foreword three chapters on the endless fascination and secret of the life of Jesus and then begins with the environment of his boyhood, discusses the thoughts and passions of those times and creates a particularly strong chapter on Jesus' facing his life's alternatives. Due consideration is given to his ministry in Galilee, his friendships with publicans and Pharisees, and the life which Jesus lived and taught. A disturbing gospel is the title of another strong chapter and the chapters dealing with the final test, his challenge, his trial, his crucifixion, and victory are beautifully phrased. When one has finished reading this book he is left with the thought that the life of Christ in the world has set up a fine heroism as practical as it is mysterious, and challenging to all who dream of a more perfect victory in human life.

A New Book from the Press of
Willett, Clark & Colby, Chicago

"The Scandal of Christianity"

By

PETER AINSLIE

Contents

I. The Blight of Denominationalism.
II. Denominationalism at a Discount in the Eyes of an Intelligent World.
III. The Awkwardness of Denominationalism in the Face of Equality of Christians before God.
IV. There is No Alternative: Church History Must Be Rewritten.
V. The Hurt to Christianity Through Denominational "Voices" — the Denominational School and the Denominational Paper.
VI. Can the World be Christianized by a Denominational Christianity?
VII. What is the Hope for the Cure of the Scandal?

This book has been in the hands of reviewers for the last three months. Many have given lengthy reviews, some editorial reviews. It has been commended and attacked. *The Survey* says: "It is a blazing, blistering excoriation of the whole denominational system. The whole system is utterly and pathetically inadequate to meet the needs of to-day." The *Times-Union*, Albany, N. Y., says: "It is frank, honest and unusually readable."

Pages 212 ***Price $2.00***

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY
230 N. FULTON AVENUE
BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

PRINTED IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE

The Christian Unity League

Will Hold a Conference of

1000 Persons from 20 Denominations

at

St. George's Church

New York City

November 13-15, 1929

This Conference is based on the Reconciliation Pact, which reads as follows:

> "We, Christians of various churches, believing that only in a coöperative and united Christendom can the world be Christianized, deplore a divided Christendom as being opposed to the Spirit of Christ and the needs of the world, and we are convinced that the Christianizing of the world is greatly hindered by divisive and rivaling churches.
>
> "We, therefore, desire to express our sympathetic interest in and prayerful attitude toward all conferences, small and large, that are looking toward reconciliation of the divided church of Christ; and we propose to recognize, in all our spiritual fellowships, the practice of equality of all Christians before God, so that no Christian shall be denied membership in our churches, nor a place in our celebration of the Lord's supper, nor pulpit courtesies be denied other ministers because they belong to a different denomination than our own; and, further, irrespective of denominational barriers, we pledge to be brethren one to another in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour, whose we are and whom we serve."

Among the personnel who are signers of the Pact are many of the most outstanding Christians in America. The Pact is definite and gets us somewhere. *The New Outlook*, Toronto, Canada, describes it as "a great step forward."

Besides 1,000 members of the Conference, there will be reservations for 1,000 to 1,200 visitors who may sign the Pact or who may decline to sign the Pact.

For further particulars address,

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY
230 N. FULTON AVE. BALTIMORE, MD.

L. XIX. No. 2 OCTOBER, 1929

"God gave unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation"

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

CONTENTS

At the Editor's Desk
Is Christian Reconciliation Possible in This Generation?

"The Scandal of Christianity" . MICHAEL WILLIAMS, C. B. WILMER, ALFRED NEVIN SAYRES, EDWARD L. ISRAEL, and H. L. MENCKEN

Further Progress in Church Union in South India . JOHN J. BANNINGA

Essentials of the Reformed Faith and System to be Conserved in Proposed Church Unions GEORGE W. RICHARDS

What is a Valid Ministry for a United Church? . ALFRED C. GARRETT

Church Unity — the World's Need . . . . FRANK A. HORNE

What People and Papers Are Saying About Unity
The Hope of This Generation is the Reunion of Non-Episcopalians — Union of Scotch Presbyterians—The South Indian Reunion Scheme—A Move for Union in Northern India — Our Evasions and Inhibitions

Letters and Comments
Constitution and By-Laws — Another View of the South India Union — Can They Get Together in the Philippines?

Book Reviews
In Memoriam: Charles Henry Brent — Training for World Friendship — The Letters of Peter Plymley to his Brother Abraham who Lives in the Country — The Master's Memorial — Religion in Soviet Russia

---

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, Inc.
W. H. HOOVER, President
230 N. FULTON AVE., BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.
AGENTS:
Fleming H. Revell Company, New York
Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendal

A Statement

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the Unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are free to all indications of Christian Unity and Ventures of Faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all others who accept Jesus as Lord and Savior — are parts of the Church of Christ and that their Equality before God is the paramount issue of modern times.

Such a journal must, necessarily, be unofficial in its attempt to be an Interpreter of the mind of the churches and in furnishing a Forum for better understanding and cordial appreciation between the divided, and sometimes far isolated, communions of Christendom. It, thereby, seeks to contribute something to clear the way to the Altar of Reconciliation.

It does not hold itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors, except in a very general way as to their character and general attitude; but it invites to its pages such contributions of thought as will, on one hand, help in the removal of misunderstandings, and, on the other, create an atmosphere where our differences may be frankly faced and freely discussed in Christian Fellowship.

All contributors are allowed the same freedom in the expression of their thoughts, as the Editor exercises for himself. He does not anticipate that others will always approve his thoughts, any more than he presumes to assume responsibility for the thoughts of others; but every writer is responsible for what appears above his own name. We are to be free to think and equally free to let think, until, in corporate thinking and corporate praying, we find the Road to Brotherhood.

Consequently, this journal is not only not the organ of any party in Christendom; but, likewise, it is not the exponent of any theory of Christian Unity. It follows the reality in personal experience of spiritual growth in Christ — growing up in Him and toward other Christians as we find the Truth, which shall free us from suspicion, prejudice, pride, and unlove. Then we shall be able to interpret Christ in those terms which He expressed in His own words,—"By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have Love one to another."

CONTENTS

OCTOBER, 1929

VOL. XIX. No. 2

AT THE EDITOR'S DESK 99

IS CHRISTIAN RECONCILIATION POSSIBLE IN THIS GENERATION? 103

"THE SCANDAL OF CHRISTIANITY" — MICHAEL WILLIAMS, C. B. WILMER, ALFRED NEVIN SAYRES, EDWARD L. ISRAEL, AND H. L. MENCKEN 106

FURTHER PROGRESS IN CHURCH UNION IN SOUTH INDIA .....JOHN J. BANNINGA 128

ESSENTIALS OF THE REFORMED FAITH AND SYSTEM TO BE CONSERVED IN PROPOSED CHURCH UNIONS ....GEORGE W. RICHARDS 135

WHAT IS A VALID MINISTRY FOR A UNITED CHURCH? ....ALFRED C. GARRETT 149

CHURCH UNITY — THE WORLD'S NEED ....FRANK A. HORNE 159

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY 168

LETTERS AND COMMENTS 185

BOOK REVIEWS 191

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY
230 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES:—THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is open to contributions from all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all other Christians who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour. It is entirely immaterial whether these contributions agree or disagree with the Editor's position, or the position of any contributor. We are seeking to bring together those who differ, for unless we frankly face our differences, and think them through, we shall never agree. THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY welcomes to its Forum all Ministers of Reconciliation.

PRICE:—The price of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, published in January, April, July, and October, is seventy-five cents a single copy, or two dollars and fifty cents a year, in the United States and all parts of the world. A local church of any communion contributing annually $5.00 or more to THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY EXTENSION FUND will be entitled to receive two copies of THE QUARTERLY free for one year—one copy going to the minister and the other copy to some designated person or institution.

Entered as second-class matter October 18th, 1923, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., U.S.A., under the Act of Congress of March 3rd, 1879.

The Christian Union Quarterly

EDITOR

Peter Ainslie, D.D., Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Beverley D. Tucker, Jr., D. D., Rector St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, Richmond, Va.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Dr. Hamilcar Alivisatos,
Athens, Greece.
Bishop Charles P. Anderson,
Chicago, Ill.
Rev. Nehemiah Boynton, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.
Dean Charles R. Brown,
New Haven, Conn.
Prof. William Adams Brown,
New York, N.Y.
Rev. Raymond Calkins, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass.
Bishop James Cannon, Jr.,
Washington, D.C.
Prof. Dr. J. Eugene Choisy,
Geneva, Switzerland.
Rev. S. D. Chown, D.D.,
Toronto, Canada.
Dr. J. A. Cramer,
Utrecht, Holland.
Prof. Dr. Adolf Deissmann,
Berlin, Germany.
Rev. A. W. Fortune, D.D.,
Lexington, Kentucky.
Dean H. E. W. Fosbroke,
New York, N.Y.
Dr. W. E. Garrison,
Chicago, Ill.
Principal Alfred E. Garvie,
London, England.
Most Rev. Metropolitan Germanos,
Thyatira, Asia Minor.
President W. A. Harper,
Elon College, N. C.
Dr. Henry T. Hodgkin,
Shanghai, China.
Rev. Finis S. Idleman, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.
Dean W. R. Inge,
London, England.
Prof. Rufus M. Jones,
Haverford, Pa.
Rev. Samuel McComb, D.D.,
Dresden, Germany.
Bishop Francis J. McConnell,
New York, N.Y.
Bishop William F. McDowell,
Washington, D.C.
Rev. William P. Merrill, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.
Dr. Wilfred Monod,
Paris, France.
Dr. C. C. Morrison,
Chicago, Ill.
Dr. John R. Mott,
New York, N.Y.
Bishop Harald Ostenfeld,
Copenhagen, Denmark.
Bishop Edward L. Parsons,
San Francisco, Calif.
President George W. Richards,
Lancaster, Pa.
Principal W. B. Selbie,
Oxford, England.
Pastor Dr. Friedrich Siegmund-Schultze,
Berlin, Germany.
Dr. Robert E. Speer,
New York, N.Y.
The Archbishop of Upsala,
Upsala, Sweden.
Dr. Henry van Dyke,
Princeton, N. J.
Rev. Joseph A. Vance, D.D.,
Detroit, Mich.
Bishop Boyd Vincent,
Cincinnati, Ohio.
The Archbishop of York,
York, England.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

OCTOBER, 1929

AT THE EDITOR'S DESK

The Scandal of Christianity is reviewed in this number of *The Christian Union Quarterly* by a Roman Catholic editor, a Protestant Episcopal professor, a minister of the Reformed church, a Jewish rabbi, and the editor of a popular monthly magazine. The editor of *The Quarterly* appreciates both their courtesy in complying with his request to write these reviews and the frankness with which they have done it. It furnishes a most interesting observation and leaves us something to think about.

In the passing of Dr. A. S. Peake, who was a member of our editorial council, the churches of Great Britain have lost one of their outstanding scholars whose humility and simplicity of character made him among the foremost interpreters of Christ to the modern mind. He will be remembered for his strong Christian faith, his fine scholarship, and his appeal to individual conscience. While a member of one of the smaller communions of the Methodist family, his influence was felt in all the communions. He lived a life preëminently worth while and will be greatly missed.

The churches have followed the way of least resistance. If we would find unity it must come by the difficult way of a living faith in our heavenly Father as interpreted by Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour. The faith that trusts God, the faith that practices good-will to all others who trust God, is the faith that will triumph. The world is wearied of definitions; it wants life. Definitions are forever secondary; life is primary. If one wants to hold to certain definitions there is no objection to that unless holding to those definitions separates him from those who hold to other definitions. "For the church to require more than Christ himself did, or to make the condition of her communion more than our Saviour did of discipleship, is wholly unwarranted." These words were written by Stillingfleet before he became the Anglican bishop of Worcester. On another page Mr. H. L. Mencken, editor of *The American Mercury,* makes the same point. This is worth thinking about.

"These divisions among the churches are all damn foolishness" said Edward VII when, as prince of Wales he was visiting in Scotland and his chaplain, Dr. Lang, now archbishop of Canterbury, objected to attending services on Sunday at a Presbyterian church because he was a priest in the church of England. The prince informed the priest that if he did not go to church with him, he could pack up and return to London forthwith. Dr. Lang decided to obey the prince and he went to the Presbyterian church on Sunday, however wicked it appeared to be. The reigning house in England has a happy arrangement. When in England they are Episcopalians, because that is the state religion; when in Scotland they are Presbyterians, because Presbyterianism is the state religion of Scotland. The difference between Episcopalianism and Presbyterianism is purely in the field of definitions and they are not very far apart there.

The elevation of Dr. Lang to the archbishopric of Canterbury has revived this incident, which we first heard many years ago on one of our trips to Scotland. While the sentence used by the prince is not in the polite language of churchmen, it is becoming the common judgment of the man on the street. Even the churchmen are finding synonymous adjectives such as "detestable," "outrageous," "scandalous" and so forth to express their hostility to the foolishness of denominationalism. Who shall say that Edward VII is not among the prophets?

As the union of the church of Scotland and the United Free church is coming to its consummation, it is regretted that there is a minority in the United Free church refusing to go along with their brethren in the union of the two churches. Why is it? It cannot be charged to Scotch caution because the union is that of two Scotch churches. Neither can it be charged to Presbyterianism because the union is to be between two Presbyterian churches. We are left to conclude that it is another instance of sectarianism, which is forever coming to the front under the guise of conscientious conviction.

The same condition arose in Canada on the union there of Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists. A Presbyterian minority refused to go into the union. We were told that a Presbyterian in the Canadian instance, who, for years had given one hundred dollars annually to the Presbyterian church, gave twenty thousand dollars to prevent the union. Instances like these need not be discouraging. They are sectarian protests that have plagued the church through the centuries. God will triumph over his stubborn children. There is nothing that can be done in instances of this character except to manifest patience and kindness to the opposition and go right along with the union of the churches. This policy was pursued in Canada and it is being pursued in Scotland. We cannot help but pity those brethren who see in Christ the orthodox promoter of division. Christ has great difficulty in revealing himself as the brother of all, but it must come before the churches can find their way to brotherhood.

We view with sympathetic interest the movement for union in South India. The churches have moved toward each other cautiously, but they have moved. Will the churches of South India go ahead if the church of England dissents from their plans? In this number of *The Quarterly* is a frank expression on the subject from a committee of Anglo-catholic scholars expressing deep interest in the movement, but affirming that if the plans are adopted as now presented some of their number "might find them so inconsistent with their principles that they could not retain their membership in any church which formally sanctioned them." This is an astonishing statement to come from a group of Christian scholars, whether they are

Anglo-catholics, Presbyterians, or Methodists; or whether they are British, Americans, or Indians. It is either the confession of the weakness of their own position or the confession of the lack of confidence in their Anglican brethren who are supporting the South India plans; and either position is untenable in these days when we are trying to get away from the rigidity of denominationalism into the larger fellowship of the whole church. The South India plans call for brethren to think together and to rethink together, certainly not to resort, at the beginning of negotiations, to the method of children saying, "If you do not do as we do, we will not play with you." It is an anti-social attitude of mind, but it is powerfully effective, particularly in church groups, where prejudice so frequently controls a situation. The union of the churches of South India is no longer an Indian problem, but it has become a problem of India and England. The Lambeth Conference of 1930, which is purely a consultative body, may or may not touch the South India church union problem. Will South India be afraid to go ahead?

We are glad to note that the Disciples and Northern Baptists made approaches to each other this year in their national gatherings. While the felicitations were general, they indicated that, in both denominations, there are those who are seeking to make friendly discoveries of each other. There is no good reason why the two bodies should not be one. If these felicitations become permanent features in their annual conventions, they will contribute tremendously to good-will and understanding. The Northern Baptists may hesitate to do anything that might appear to break with the great Baptist family, those wearing the Baptist name, and the Disciples, likewise, may hesitate to take a step that might cause further disturbance in their ranks. But the fact that, in both households, there are those who are seeking for understanding and appreciation furnishes good evidence that what began will go forward. Both bodies are extremely individualistic and, perhaps, the most hopeful line of approach will be by local fellowship. When these become sufficiently strong, their annual conventions will act more definitely and courageously. But, in the meantime, every effort should be made to cultivate closer relations. The principle of the union of the two bodies must go far beyond the mere fact that both practice baptism by immersion. If that is all to bind the two together it will not hold. A common baptism has not held the thirteen varieties of Baptists together, nor has a common baptism held the two varieties of Disciples together. Forms and ceremonies have their place but the union of the church of Christ goes far deeper than forms and ceremonies. The Disciples and Baptists ought to get together, but their common baptism should not be regarded as a primary factor in the union. The union must be on Christ.

Is Christian Reconciliation Possible in This Generation?

For the church of Christ to be divided into more than two hundred denominations with their separate organizations is a condition that is gradually becoming painfully observed by Christians all over the world as unspiritual and unchristian. These breaches have got to be healed. These party-cries have got to be abandoned. Christians must become reconciled, or Christianity is doomed. It can live for centuries in forms, but it cannot go on perpetually divided, and, at the same time, release the Spirit of Christ for the healing of the world.

The Federal Council and its companion movement, the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, have made a great contribution to unity by bringing coöperation and understanding among Christian bodies. These cannot be praised too highly. Likewise the World Conference on Faith and Order has made a great contribution to Christian unity. It has invited a restudy of the creeds and the priesthood. These vary in valuation in various churches and it is well for the whole church to restudy these values.

The Christian Unity League is a fellowship of individual Christians who, while friendly to all that is being done by other movements for the unity of Christendom, feel that until we come to the recognition of all Christians as equals before

God and to practice a definite attitude of brotherhood toward all Christians we are not going to get out of our denominational entanglements. It is, therefore, an adventure to go another step further toward the fulfillment of the ideal and prayer of Jesus for oneness among his followers.

There is a large sentiment in all the churches for the unity of our Lord's followers, far beyond the official pronouncements of the denominations. The Christian Unity League has come to meet this need, as no other movement is sufficiently inclusive in its approaches. It, therefore, does not parallel any movement and is the rival of none, but values whatever contributions others have made and includes them in its study.

Membership in the League is conditioned on signing the Pact of Reconciliation, which is as follows:

> "We, Christians of various churches, believing that only in a coöperative and united Christendom can the world be Christianized, deplore a divided Christendom as being opposed to the Spirit of Christ and the needs of the world, and we are convinced that the Christianizing of the world is greatly hindered by divisive and rivaling churches.
>
> "We, therefore, desire to express our sympathetic interest in and prayerful attitude toward all conferences, small and large, that are looking toward reconciliation of the divided church of Christ; and we propose to recognize, in all our spiritual fellowships, the practice of equality of all Christians before God, so that no Christian shall be denied membership in our churches, nor a place in our celebration of the Lord's supper, nor pulpit courtesies be denied other ministers because they belong to a different denomination than our own; and, further, irrespective of denominational barriers, we pledge to be brethren one to another in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour, whose we are and whom we serve."

This is a simple proposition to show us where we are. Signatures came so readily that it was decided to abandon sending out requests for signatures, and, instead, to prepare for a conference where many of these free and unafraid men and women could meet together for a frank discussion of the issues that had been raised by the Pact of Reconciliation. The hospitality of St. George's Protestant Episcopal Church, New York, was accepted for the place of meeting. The date is November 13-15.

The League proposes to be democratic. Christian unity must be taken to the people. It is the people's problem. The League is inviting to this conference, ministers, women, and laymen. If it fails to have these equally proportioned in the conference at St. George's it will be due to its inability to find those in the various churches who are interested in Christian unity. This will take time. If they are not found for this conference they will be found for later conferences, which are to follow.

The recognition of all Christians before God must be frankly faced. One denomination posing as being superior to another denomination because of this, that, or the other and, therefore, refusing membership, the Lord's supper and its pulpit to another because he is not of the same denomination is altogether an improper condition of affairs in the church of Christ.

We must write in our consciences in large letters — "One is your teacher and you are all brothers." The reality of good-will for the whole church must be expressed in those human terms of interest in others of other denominations, our defence of them if they are neglected or attacked, and our prayer for them under all circumstances. The broken brotherhood of Christians is the greatest sin of the age. Therefore, Christians must do all that is possible in this generation to restore brotherhood.

No generation has been so free, so well informed, and so dependable for adventurous action as this generation. This has been particularly evident in politics and science. Christianity will be seriously impaired if it fails to make like adventures. These are the promptings of life. Statesmen have responded and we have the League of Nations and the outlawry of war. Scientists have responded and roads of travel have been laid in the air and the record of brilliant discoveries crowd the pages of daily papers. It is not only possible for the Christians of this generation to unite in a real brotherhood of good-will and adventure, but it is obligatory upon us to do it. The conference at St. George's in November proposes to be a contribution to it.

"THE SCANDAL OF CHRISTIANITY"*

Reviewed by MICHAEL WILLIAMS, Editor of *The Commonweal,* New York; REV. C. B. WILMER, D.D., Professor of Practical Theology, University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee; REV. ALFRED NEVIN SAYRES, Pastor of St. John's Reformed church, Lansdale, Pennsylvania; RABBI EDWARD L. ISRAEL, Har Sinai synagogue, Baltimore, Maryland; and H. L. MENCKEN, Editor of *The American Mercury,* Baltimore, Maryland.

MR. WILLIAMS: Dr. Peter Ainslie speaks in his book, *The Scandal of Christianity,* of "a library of five hundred volumes written in the last twenty-five years," which, as he truly says, is undoubtedly "a fair register of the interest in abolishing denominationalism for a united Christendom." Speaking as a Catholic layman, it is my opinion that Dr. Ainslie's own book should be regarded as one of the most significant of the contributions to this tremendous mass of discussion of the central problem of Christendom, although I cannot say that I have read so very many of the other books; indeed, simply because I am a Catholic, I am too firmly fixed in my belief that I belong to the church of Christendom, and not to a denomination of Christians, to give much of my time and attention to the study of the literature of this problem.

Dr. Ainslie may regard such an attitude on my part as proof positive of the evil with which he is attempting to deal — namely, an exclusive attitude on the part of one claiming the title of Christian which acts as a bar to that real brotherhood of all Christians which he desires to see established. As a Catholic, however, while sympathizing with Dr. Ainslie's point of view, and recognizing why it seems to him to be correct, I must enter my dissent; a dissent which I consider to be the same that is held by all Catholics. In other words, I see no necessary contradiction between the belief of the Catholic that he is in strict truth a member of the one true church established by Christ, and also that all other Christians who do not recognize the Catholic church as the one true church may at the same time be — and indeed often are — most sincere and splendid Christians who are, as the Catholic sees the matter, despite their denial of the Catholic claim, members of the soul of the church; therefore, Catholics. A consistent following of this principle in action should lead all Catholics to deal with those who they must regard as their separated brethren in a spirit of unshakable charity, and with a hope based upon a belief in the fulfillment of that prayer of the founder of the church which Dr. Ainslie quotes: "May they all be one! As thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, so may they be in us — that the world may believe thou has sent me."

---

* *The Scandal of Christianity* by Peter Ainslie. Willett, Clark & Colby, 440 S. Dearborn St., Chicago; pages 212; price $2.00.

As was natural, I was particularly interested in those parts of Dr. Ainslie's eloquent plea for Christian brotherhood which dealt with what Dr. Ainslie would regard as my own denomination. With a very great deal of what he has to say — and which he says so splendidly — I find myself in hearty agreement. For example, that "it is equally obligatory for Catholics to make approaches to Protestants. It is a question of maintaining friendly approaches on the part of both, which is truly Christian, or of maintaining attitudes of suspicion and fear, which is thoroughly anti-Christian."

Even if such attempts at understanding, such "adventures in Christian fellowship," as Dr. Ainslie phrases it, should break down, through the fault of either side or of both, because of inherited suspicions, jealousies, or prejudices, Dr. Ainslie with almost passionate fervor pleads for such attempts to be made over and over again. In that view he is right. When contacts are truly established between Catholics and Protestants for the purpose of discussing the central problem of the unity of Christendom, there will be a real approach to that goal. And undoubtedly on both sides there must be the utmost frankness as well as the utmost attainable coöperation, and mutual attempts to understand not only what the other side says, but what it feels, and the reasons both for statements and for emotions.

This brings me to the point which I feel to be fundamental, namely, the necessity for frankness even more than for friendliness. In this matter, frankness is true friendliness. Friendliness which is expressed by the shirking of difficult discussions could not long maintain itself even among individuals belonging to the same group; still less could it be maintained by groups approaching each other in order to get at the reason why they are segregated into groups.

In this spirit of frank friendliness, and since Dr. Ainslie laid it down as a condition that in reviewing his book I should say what truly was in my mind, I cannot help but register my belief that Dr. Ainslie is wrong when he thinks that all Christians should cast aside their theology and their belief in organized forms of religion as prerequisites to the attainment of a spiritual brotherhood.

Whatever a world of pure spirit may be, it is certain that in this world of time and space and matter, everything, including the manifestation of spirit, is organized; under definite laws; and this is as true of the church as it is of human society in general and in particular. Even Dr. Ainslie partly admits this practical truth, when after declaring that all hierarchical forms must be abolished in the interests of Christian brotherhood, he goes on to say that "superintendents," or "leaders" will still probably be necessary. Is this not largely a mere change of name, and not a real doing away with what the name signifies? As a Catholic looks at the matter, the founder of Christianity established a church; one church, not a number of churches; he placed the apostles over that church, in positions of authority. Whether we call these apostles bishors or superintendents does not get away from the fact of their authority; not self-assumed, but given to them by the source of all authority.

If such a church were to last beyond the lifetime of these first bishops or superintendents, obviously they must have successors possessing the same authority. Moreover, what Christ taught also had to be handed down; it was inevitable that it should be expressed in language; and that is all that theology really means, namely, the definition of truth in terms that can be understood by human reason. Now, the Catholic does believe — or else he would not be a Catholic — that he is a member of that one church, over which the founder of Christianity placed leaders now called bishops, having definite authority; and that theology is just as necessary, although no more necessary, than the laws of a nation are necessary to the orderly process of the business of that nation.

But in believing this, no Catholic, it seems to me, can do other than welcome all forms of honest and friendly discussion with other Christians who believe otherwise; and in the bringing about of such discussions Dr. Ainslie's book should play an important part.

MICHAEL WILLIAMS.

DR. WILMER: The greatest scandal of Christianity, according to the author, "is that Christians have not learned how to behave toward each other." If "behavior" is taken not in its Watsonian sense but, as it should be, in its true sense, as an outward expression of inner spirit, conduct, the stream that flows continuously from the spring of character, Dr. Ainslie is profoundly right. "On the night in which he was betrayed, Jesus, knowing that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end. . . . And during supper, the devil having already put into the heart of Judas Iscariot . . . to betray him, Jesus, knowing that the Father had put all things into his hands, and that he came forth from God, and goeth unto God, riseth from supper and layeth aside his garments; and he took a towel and girded himself. Then he poured water into the basin and began to wash the disciples' feet and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded. . . .

"So when he had washed their feet and taken his garments and was sat down again, he said unto them: Know ye not what I have done unto you? Ye call me Master and Lord; and ye say well for so I am. If I, then, the Lord and the Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye also should do as I have done unto you."

Again, "Even as the Father hath loved me, I also have loved you; abide ye in my love. . . . These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy may be in you and that your joy may be fulfilled. *This is my commandment, that ye love one another, even as I have loved you."*

These words require no comment. Anybody can understand them. And we all know what has happened since that Thursday night nineteen centuries ago. It is the greatest conceivable irony, the contrast between the ideals of the Lord for his people and the cold facts.

History repeats itself, though in worse degree. St. Paul wrote to the chosen people, to them, that is, who had been called of God to make his name known and honored, "the name of God is *blasphemed* among the Gentiles, *because of you."* But it has been left to Christians, through "entering into a holier sanctuary to be guilty of a greater sacrilege." Christians have murdered each other and still hate each other; and the very sacrament of fellowship, the holy Communion, has become, perhaps more than anything else, the cause of division, controversy, mutual recrimination.

This truly is the *scandal* of Christianity. Not that Christians do not live perfect lives, the acquisition of character is gradual, we "are being saved"; not that Christians do not fulfil their duties to outsiders, to the world, to paganism, that is negative, a "shortcoming"; but the failure of Christians to love each other, that is "scandal," a "stumbling block," something seeking God and the truth; at any rate, in the "way" along which must travel those who would come to God. Christ prayed that his followers might be one in order that the world might believe in his mission from the Father.

What has happened, what stares us in the face, is the cruel fact that not only does the church fail to bear this witness—and even ecclesiastics of a certain type argue that all meaning must be watered out of our Lord's words, as though some vague kind of "unity" had been meant which is not visible to the naked eye of the "world" and is hence of no conceivable value as witness — not only is it the case that Christians do not even have the intelligence of Beelzebub, sense enough to stick together against a kingdom of evil that presents a united front, but they actually make war on each other. That is the "scandal," the "stumbling block" of Christianity, "Christianity" meaning, not the teachings of Christ, but the actual doings of his professed followers down the ages.

It is "scandal" in Shakespeare's sense:

> "O, what a scandal is it to our crown
> That two such noble peers as ye should jar!"

This is the story that Dr. Ainslie has presented with passionate fervor and conviction. As an indictment of the evils of denominationalism, the book is terriffic and unanswerable. If Dr. Ainslie's book does not convert a Christian to believe in church unity that Christian must be a hopeless case.

The only two chapters which raise questions are chapter IV, "Church History Must be Re-written," and chapter VII, "What is the Hope for Cure of this Scandal?"

Dr. Ainslie's spirit is so fine throughout that it seems almost ungracious to say that I think one serious, not to say fatal, defect runs through his analysis of church history and also into his constructive plans for the future. He seems to me to look at serious questions of principle from a somewhat sentimental point of view. He even reminds me at times, if he will pardon the comparison, of the politician who asked in convention, "What's the constitution between friends?"

The love which is to bind all Christians together in Jesus Christ is not mere good nature or amiability without backbone. And since it is church unity that we are discussing and not merely courtesy between individual Christians or denominations, we are obliged to discuss, it seems to me, principles of church organization.

But whatever be the occasion, the fundamental principle to bear in mind is, "love rejoiceth in the truth." To ask one

Christian minister to invite a Christian minister of another denomination as a matter of "courtesy," is, it seems to me, to do injustice to men's serious convictions and to befog the whole question at issue. It would put the Roman Catholic, for instance, under the bane of being discourteous simply because he does not agree with the Protestant theory of the ministry; and that, I must consider to be unchristian and unjust.

A. The re-writing of church history. In the re-writing of church history, as outlined by Dr. Ainslie, it seems to me that it is wrong to charge up all theological and ecclesiastical differences of opinion to arrogance and quarrelsomeness. It seems to me that we need some philosophy of church history based on distinguishing between the truth which is at issue and the spirit, tolerant or intolerant, in which each man may hold his conviction.

For lack of such philosophy Dr. Ainslie, while hating denominationalism, fails to do justice to the place occupied by denominationalism in the evolution of the church as the body of Christ, and of Christian theology, as the interpretation of Christ. I suggest, in brief outline, a philosophy of the church and its history, so far as unity is concerned, that the church first had to work out the problem of solidarity along with the social sacraments and corporate authority. Even the papacy was probably necessary for a time to hold things together.

Then came the Protestant Reformation which was fundamentally the assertion of individualism over against the overdone principle of authority (*vide* Newman Smyth's *Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism*).

It is not to be doubted that the basest passions of men were aroused in this great movement; nevertheless the Reformation can be properly appraised only as a necessary step in progress toward the third stage which is our only possible goal. The real united church of the future must be one as against Protestant divisions; but it must be a church rich in its manifold expressions of the human spirit, as against the enforced uniformity of Rome.

B. From this evoluntary point of view, this "space—time" method of thinking, denominationalism is seen to be a necessary evil but a perverted good, with a needed contribution to make to the church of the future when brought into harmony with the whole.

I think Dr. Ainslie's plan, admirable as it is in many respects, is open to the objection that it may cause still greater divisions inside of existing denominations. It is even possible that seeking church unity by insisting on open communion (in which I personally believe) and through mutual recognition of all existing Christian ministries without getting at the fundamental principles on which agreement is necessary, as a condition of conference, may make matters even worse than they are and bring about "confusion worse confounded."

Nevertheless, I may be wrong and I am sure that one result of Dr. Ainslie's book must be to make us all feel and determine by some means to cure "the scandal of Christianity."

C. B. WILMER.

MR. SAYRES: There is no pussy-footing about this drastic indictment of a "church with nearly two thousand years back of it, scandalized by a denominationalism that denies Christian brotherhood to the world and so conceals Christ as to make him one of the obscure characters of history." But if drastic be a proper term to apply to Dr. Ainslie's treatment of his theme, it is equally true that his reasoning and his charges are incontrovertible. Any fair-minded reader who is willing to set aside his own denominational prejudices must concede the truths, which are apparent when stated, concerning the manner in which denominational Christianity has been "unfair to Christ," but which have been hidden from eyes that have been veiled by sectarian viewpoints.

All harshness is removed from Dr. Ainslie's ruthless diagnosis of Christendom's malady by the manifest spirit of penitence which characterizes his writing. In contrition he repents of the sins of his own communion, which he spares not at all in his wholesale arraignment of sectarianism. Moreover, it is well known that he has sought to purge his own conduct of sectarian habits and has evidenced the brotherly spirit in countless ways.

With the origins of our divisions the author would have nothing to do. Whatever purpose they may have served in the past has been served, he believes, and to-day these divisions constitute the major stumbling block to the church's entrance at the wide open door of opportunity to serve a needy world. A woefully unchristian world waits at the church's door to be healed. Not only in spite of Christianity, but often in its name, men have gone at one another's throats in wholesale murder. In a pagan society men need to be guided into the ways of Christian brotherhood. The working world stands at the church's door in need of Christ's saving Spirit. Facing a world of peoples under the menace of internal war and a society torn by class conflict, a denominational, and, therefore, divided, church cannot Christainize the world.

The book is more than a brochure for the organic union of the churches. It pursues sectarian features of Christianity to its remotest corners. It calls for the elimination of some, the merger of others, and the conversion of all, denominational colleges and seminaries and papers. It treats denominationalism as a spiritual disease to be eradicated from the body of the church.

The way of its removal is of course the way of penitence and brotherhood. The churches must recognize the sin and folly of which they have been guilty and bring forth the fruits of brotherhood that are meet for such repentance. This must be accomplished not by a grand resolution of ecclesiastical assembly, but by a definite pedagogical program that will reach the laity and the ministers of all churches.

This appeal for brotherhood is not made with any cheap or shallow notion of the meaning of brotherhood. The author is well aware of the costliness of the brotherly spirit. But he takes Jesus in earnest and thinks of the Christian discipleship as "a brotherhood of personalities trying to conquer hate, pride, and falsehood by the practice of trust, humility, and truth." In a Christendom as thoroughly saturated as ours is with bias and prejudice and bigotry it is not easy to practice these Christian principles. To one earnest adventurer in Christian brotherliness who sought Dr. Ainslie's counsel concerning his attempt at brotherhood, Dr. Ainslie replied, "Can you stand it? If you can, go ahead."

The facts of the author's attack upon the citadel of denominationalism within his own communion are well known. Though there is no mention of these facts in the book, they form a fitting background for the reader, as he follows the heroic summons to a crusade for brotherhood. Using the analogy of the scientific explorers who risk being hurt and killed in their adventures, all the while getting a tremendous kick out of what they are doing, the author says, "What is our religion if we do not likewise get a kick out of it? Our adventures in Christian brotherhood may mean such minor hurts as loss of reputation or loss of position," but "the tragedy of the church is its timidity" and only a daring and sacrificial friendliness can purge Christianity of its shameful scandal.

Naturally the author contends that creeds and forms and rituals must not be allowed to stand as barriers between Christians. They should not be made the *sine qua non* of church membership. Particularly in the Lord's supper all theological interpretations should be subordinated and denominational restrictions set aside, so that, in the atmosphere of this holy fellowship, Christians may learn to feel the "unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace."

Dr. Ainslie has no mental reservations when he pleads for a reunited Christendom. It is not Protestantism that he is seeking to unite, but all Christendom. "The reunited church of the future must be wide enough to include Friends and Unitarians and Catholics and all who claim discipleship with Jesus Christ. Who would close the door to William Penn, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and Francis of Assissi? The gauge must be set by the mind and Spirit of him who said, 'He who is not against us is for us.' "

Nevertheless, Dr. Ainslie recognizes the gigantic changes that are involved in his hope, but he insists that "what we now are and what Jesus prayed for us to be is no more impossible than the development of our barbarian forbears into Christian men and women. The individual follower is charged to reproduce a life like Jesus. Then denominationalism must go as human slavery has gone, as ignorance among the masses is going, as every other unjust thing must go, and be so abhorred in its going that it will not attempt reëstablishment."

"The scandal of Christianity" should be echoed through all the pulpits of Christendom. If our hearts be not too hard, it will work changes in them and in the structure of Christianity, such changes as will lead to a more Christlike Christianity.

Alfred Nevin Sayres.

RABBI ISRAEL: "What do you mean by an interdenominational service; one of those milk-and-water affairs full of meaningless sentimentality?" The speaker was a leading Protestant clergyman in a fair sized middle-western city. The dictum was uttered at a meeting called by the local chamber of commerce to consider a joint civic Sunday service which was to be participated in by all sects and creeds. I was rather young in the ministry at the time and it was quite a shock to me to hear the communion of human kind after a common Father termed "milk-and-water sentimentality." I was, however, destined to learn much of intolerance and human folly. I was to learn that tolerance, and particularly religious tolerance is, to many, synonymous with moral cowardice, that the ability to understand and sympathize with another's attempt to dip into the depth of the eternal mystery is regarded as a yielding up of loyalty to one's own ideals. I was destined to behold instance after instance of man's inhumanity to man in the name of sectarian loyalties, and worst of all, to witness efforts of laymen to reach better understanding with their fellowmen of other faiths attacked and crushed by so-called "ministers of God," not obscure underlings but leaders in their denominations.

Only last summer, I learned of one of these tragic results of denominational rivalries. One of the most prominent and scholarly state universities of our land desired to institute a school of religion at which Biblical science, archæology, and the like would be taught. It was to be free from denominational bias, and was to be thoroughly scholarly in character, in accord with the spirit of the institution under which it was to function. One would imagine that any plan which would make for a better knowledge of our Biblical literature would be welcomed by any clergyman in this day and age, when such knowledge is only too infrequent, and so sadly neglected by the more cultured among us. The splendid plan failed because the Protestant sects, through their clerical representatives, started quarreling among themselves; the Baptists insisting that they would have a Baptist and none other as head of the school, the Methodists insisting on a Methodist, and the Presbyterians holding out for one of their own. Not wanting to become involved in a religious war, the university authorities abandoned the plan completely.

I could recount many another instance of this sort from my own knowledge. There is the story of my friend S., one of the finest Christian gentlemen whom I have ever met, driven out of a little denominational college because he dared tolerate in his classes the mention of religious points of view differing from the creed of his own church. There is our recent experience in Baltimore where the ecclesiastical head of a great church disrupted the plans for an interdenominational civic Thanksgiving service, asserting that the members of his church could, under no considerations, bow their heads in prayer at a service at which the ministers of another faith addressed God.

It is the narrowness and pettiness of this obscurantist attitude that Dr. Peter Ainslie attacks in heroic manner in his estimable volume *The Scandal of Christianity.* Already from secular sources have we had some extremely interesting and significant declarations on the subject. Bruce Barton in his widely read *The Man Nobody Knows* gave eloquent expression to the futility and disgustingness of much of the denominationalism as it is currently practiced. Harold Bell Wright, demonstrating how popular the subject has become, handles it in characteristic manner in his *God and the Groceryman.* Dr. Ainslie's approach is more scholarly, more direct, more incisive, and more trenchant than any which I have seen to date. His handling of the subject is characteristic of the man. Fearless, prophetic and with a burning and unquenchable yearning for humanity and justice, he faces facts as he sees them, spares no sect or creed, not even his own, nor does he mince words.

It is somewhat difficult for a Jew and a rabbi to discuss Christian denominationalism. As my handling of the matter progresses, the reader will undoubtedly discern a fundamental difference in point of view which cannot be submerged. In the general spirit of this excellent volume, I am at one with the high-minded author. There are, however, certain inconsistencies of approach, and certain implications which he fails to face, and whcih I intend to present. I do so in all humility, because the basis of my fundamental agreement with the author and volume is that truth is not the monopoly of any individual or church. I submit my reactions with due deference and with full consideration for the opposing opinions of others.

THE CASE AGAINST DENOMINATIONALISM

With telling devastation, Dr. Ainslie hurls his stalwart shafts against the bigotry of Christian sects and their hard and fast rigor in excluding from the community of Christian worship those who differ from them in creedal belief. With prophetic zeal he continues with his exposé of the failure of the Christian religion under denominational control particularly in the matter of the world war, where the churches showed their powerlessness to become a real obstacle to the mad slaughter, and in fact, were swept off their feet and joined in the bloodlusty cry of the mob. Dr. Ainslie can well make this condemnation, for he was one of the few clergymen of our land who refused to be stampeded into a loss of the truly religious attitude during the entire war. He points out how the great social message of religion has been either lost or obscured in the midst of denominational conflict. His words are too true. Some of our southern states at the present time are going through the travail that inevitably attends the birth of an industrial civilization out of an agricultural one. Mob violence and hatreds of the worst sort abound. In the religious leadership of these communities there is plenty of time spent on argument over creedal differences but there is no voice being raised locally in the name of religious social justice to lead men out of the morass of hate and greed to a finer spirit of brotherhood.

In courageous manner, Dr. Ainslie opens his book with the words: "The greatest scandal of civilization is that Christians have not learned how to behave toward each other." In other words, denominationalism has drowned out the voice of Christian brotherhood. Dr. Ainslie might have gone farther and added: "And not having learned how to behave toward each other, they have surely not learned how to behave toward humanity in general."

The author does not close his eyes to the advantages that arise from a varied pursuit of truth. He does not plead for uniformity. He desires a spiritual unity among Christians which will not obliterate any differences of view, but which will transcend them in the name of the higher spiritual unity.

Finally, in his case against denominationalism, Dr. Ainslie with characteristic fearlessness, denounces the gratuitous arrogance of Roman Catholicism, in its assertion of an absolute monopoly of spiritual truth, and in its unwillingness to allow its adherents a free search into the divine realities that other men may hold. Coming from any of the thousands of "Rome-baiters" in the Protestant pulpits, this definance of the Catholic assumption of divine monopoly would have little or no significance. Coming as it does from a man who is known in his own community and elsewhere as one of the most liberal and tolerant souls imaginable, and who has the respect and confidence of Catholic priests as few other Protestants have, it is a significant and courageous challenge.

THE CASE FOR DENOMINATIONALISM

Our author fails, in his wholesale denunciation of denominationalism for its crimes and misdemeanors, to give it credit for some of its possibilities of a more salutary nature. It is obviously unfair to say that Christianity or any other religion has failed because the human expression of that faith in its physical incorporation in a church organization falls short of the ideals of the founding spirit or spirits. Equally is it fallacious to decry denominationalism as completely unworthy because denominations, in the exercise of their functions, have fallen short of the ideals in which they were born.

Human kind learn best the general virtues from specific application. The concepts of human idealism go from the individual to the group, from the immediate group to the larger body of mankind in general. The prophets of Israel learned the love of God for all mankind from their love for Israel. Hosea learned the love of God for Israel from the individual experience of his own unfortunate domestic life. We learn the love of children best from the experiences of our own parenthood. We learn the love of womankind from our devotion to one woman. Christian brotherhood is designed the better to teach Christians the larger love of all mankind. So, it is possible that denominations can render a very valuable service by teaching from the application of ideals to the smaller group the expansion of the concept to the world at large. That they have failed to do this is obvious. I do not dispute Dr. Ainslie's condemnation of them on this ground. But the greater possibility of a clearer and more vital appreciation of spiritual ideals through rightly understood denominationalism rather than through an attempt to appreciate these ideals first of all in the general and broader field, I unhesitatingly maintain to be a fact. Denominations must learn this and realize it.

Then, too, in his sweeping condemnation of denominationalism, Dr. Ainslie forgets that, in the strictest sense, Christianity is in itself a denominational outgrowth of Judaism. It sometimes is impossible for a group of likeminded people to express their ideas and ideals without making a definite break with the body at large. Early Christianity was a sect of Judaism, but it could not long continue so. Despite a common belief in the fatherhood of God and brotherhood of mankind, there were certain fundamental differences which made a more or less complete cleavage absolutely essential. The early Christians are not to be condemned for breaking away from the parent religion and establishing themselves into a community with common aims and beliefs. You cannot prevent men from doing this at any time. It is perfectly correct to denounce the extravagances of a denomination and its fanatical stand on minor items of difference. To insist, however, that it yield up its individuality is unwarranted. The fault is not essentially with denominationalism as such, but with the arrogant assumptions of infallibility and the petty struggles and hatreds that arise therefrom. Dr. Ainslie admirably denounces these errors. He fails to give adequate expression to the sound bases for difference, the reasons for separatism and the possibilities for good that lie in healthy difference, humanely expressed.

INCONSISTENCIES REGARDING GOD-MONOPOLY

In approaching this section of my reaction to the stimulating volume under discussion, I must again assert the humility with which I set forth some of my views. True, I do not approach the volume as a Christian, but I approach it by no means as an enemy of Christianity or as one who fails to give due credit to the fine spiritual influences which noble Christian spirits, teaching the doctrines of their faith, have brought to the world. Yet, without the slightest anti-Christian bias, and with the utmost respect and reverence for the Christian faith, certain objections obtrude as I read the book.

I agree most profoundly with the author's glorious defiance of the assumption of monopoly of divine ideals by any denominational group. But must we not go farther? Is there not something equally gratuitous in the assumption which occurs again and again throughout the entire volume, that Christianity itself in its larger aspect constitutes a monopoly of divine truth? We read: "Who dares to say, without betraying a biased conscience, that those who believe in God, in Jesus Christ, in the holy Spirit, and in the Scriptures have departed from the truth because some of their interpretations differ from our own?" With the utmost reverence, I ask: "Who dares, without betraying a biased conscience, to maintain that a belief in the trinity is indispensable to a knowledge of God, and that all who hold varying beliefs are spiritually benighted?" Again, our author asserts: "Denominationalism is as deadening to spirituality on the one hand, as is the denial of Jesus Christ in the redemption of the world, on the other hand." To my mind, such an attitude is merely the basis on which denominationalism can assert its right to all the actions and beliefs which Dr. Ainslie so roundly and veritably denounces. True Christianity, true Judaism, true Buddhism, true Islam, or what not, have to learn the same humility of spiritual attitude for which Dr. Ainslie pleads with regard to denominations within the Christian fold. In the light of the larger humanity, there need be no yielding up of individual beliefs, any more than there need be in denominationalism; yet these beliefs must be tempered by the more sweeping concepts of the fundamental fatherhood of God and brotherhood of humanity, as in the Christian sects, denominational creeds must be tempered in the light of the more fundamental concept of the Christ. After all, the special revelation of any particular faith, in the light of modern religious liberalism, must be regarded merely as a means of approach to something of a knowledge of divine reality. No church or prophet of any faith can encompass the knowledge of the infinite God in its entirety. This is true of all religions. It is true of my own faith as well as that of the other man. I love my own faith none the less for it. It means just as much as it possibly can to me. So, too, intelligent Christians must come to regard the Christ as a medium of spiritual expression; to them, it is true, the finest, as to each man, his faith seems the finest. But neither the Christ or any other revelation can honestly be maintained to be the sole medium or the sole expression of God; or for that matter, the best adaptable to the other man, however well it may fill every spiritual demand of our own natures.

THE DENOMINATIONAL SPIRIT AND MISSIONARY ZEAL

As I arrive at the final section of these thoughts, I am even more strongly aware of fundamental differences which will divide me from most of my readers. Yet, in reading Dr. Ainslie's book, I could not help being aroused to thought at the oft reiterated statements as to the necessity of "the Christianizing of the world." I know full well what the evangelical spirit means to the Christian. I wonder, though, whether this concept of world-Christianization as expressed in the missionary movements is not the inherent trouble which makes such a book as *The Scandal of Christianity* necessary. The feeling that it is essential for us to convert others to our religious point of view contains within itself the very assumptions of a monopoly of belief which cannot but be copied by each little sect and creed of Christianity as it arises.

This concept unfortunately can do strange things to even the most tolerant and liberal souls, among whom the author of the book is to be numbered. Again and again throughout its pages he pleads for a cessation of narrowness on the part of the various sects of Christianity in order that Christianity in the large may know true "Christian fellowship" and "Christian brotherhood." The fundamental requisite of modern society, so it seems to me, is to know fellowship and brotherhood in the broader sense, and not through propagandizing by one or another religious faith to bring about a world uniformity. World uniformity in general is no more desirable than Christian uniformity in particular. If the main purpose of the elimination of the evil of denominationalism, as the book implies, is to unite the forces of Christianity for a world missionizing enterprise, then we have no right to take issue with the Catholic for his attitude, since he alone knew anything that approximated Christian unity. No, our author seems indubitably guilty of a glaring inconsistency, unless he is ready to regard the desirability of a unified Christianity merely as a spiritual end in itself, and not as a means to a process whose spiritual justice is questionable, at least from the point of view of the great majority of human kind.

It is my firm conviction that the missionizing complex held both by Christianity and Islam is the most serious obstacle to the full universalization of both these religions. In even the noblest souls among their adherents, it makes them stop short of truly universalistic attitudes. Witness the very book which we have under discussion. Among his fine, courageous pleas, Dr. Ainslie advocates a complete rewriting of the church histories of the various Christian sects. In this rewriting, the histories are to be freed from the animus of sect prejudices and interdenominational hatreds. It is his feeling that such a rewriting can take place without a loss of the fundamental truth of the convictions held by the various sects. By this revision he feels that "a better standard of behavior may be established in the church of Christ." Yet he stops completely short of advocating a rewriting of the histories of all religions of mankind whereby the many bitternesses of men all over the world that exist in the name of religion will be eradicated, making for a finer standard of behavior among all men of whatever church or creed or faith, and without a loss of fundamental convictions. The necessity of banding the church of Christ into a world-missionizing bond prevents him from taking the final step toward world unity.

I make no argument against the inspiring teachings of that church of Christ at its finest and best. I feel most strongly, however, that the real spiritual world dominion of Christianity, if ever it is to be accomplished, will come through the demonstration of the superior spiritual power of the Christian doctrine as demonstrated in the lives of those who uphold and practice it, and not through propaganda and salesmanship. The eye to propaganda and salesmanship is blind to the finer world unities.

It is undoubtedly a real inspiration for the true Christian to find God through prayer in Christian unity, as our author so strongly advocates. But there is also another finding of God, which, to my mind, has even added merits. It is expressed in a few lines of verse which I can never forget.

> "My brother kneels," so saith Kabir,
> "To stone and brass in heathenwise;
> Yet in my brother's voice I hear
> Mine own unanswered ecstasies;
> His gods are as his Fates assign;
> His prayer is all the worlds — and mine!"

"The scandal of Christianity" is, in fact, the scandal of the entire world of human kind. Until men realize that "neither the heaven of heavens can contain thee," and how much less the feeble human instrumentalities of church or creed or prophet—until we banish all arrogance of belief under the inspiration of some slight grasp of the truly infinite nature of God, we shall still go on in our blasphemy, failing to see his light as it shines through the souls of his creatures, wherever they may be, and however they may reach out to him.

EDWARD L. ISRAEL.

MR. MENCKEN: Dr. Ainslie's title, it seems to me, is somewhat misleading. The scandal that he discusses has little, if anything, to do with Christianity *per se;* it is an affair of churches and theologians. With exceptions so few as to be negligible, the quarrels which divide the churches would be unintelligible to Jesus, supposing him returned to earth. More, they would strike him as disgusting. For if he had in him any hatred at all, it was hatred of harsh and unyielding dogmas. He saw clearly that belief in this or that formula or obedience to this or that law did not and could not make men better. What he preached was not a new set of doctrines, but a new way of living. His effort was not to make men sounder theologians, but to make them aspire to a greater virtue. He put no emphasis on orthodoxy; he put it all on common decency.

Why is it impossible, nearly two thousand years after his death, for the two principal branches of the church he founded to meet in amity? The cause is plain enough: it lies in purely dogmatic differences. The elder church, cloaking itself in the usage of centuries, refuses to give up certain doctrines. It refuses to give up the doctrine that the bishop of Rome is superior to all other teachers, and that his judgments are thus binding upon all the faithful. It refuses to give up the doctrine that the wine and bread of the eucharist are converted into the actual blood and flesh of Jesus. It refuses, also, to give up other doctrines, some of them important and some not, but these are the salient ones.

Well, where is the authority for them in the teaching of Jesus? I can find none. He knew nothing about the primacy of the pope; he was, in fact, violently opposed to the pretensions of all bishops and priests; if he had any theology at all, that was his theology in brief. Nor is there the slightest evidence, direct or indirect, that he ever heard of the doctrine of transubstantiation, or that he would have approved it if it had been presented to him. The probabilities all run the other way. His general bent of mind was against such things. His effort was not to make religion more complicated and mysterious; it was to make it simpler and clearer. Always he tried to reduce the hocus-pocus of priests and to make the faith that was in him a plain and homely thing, comprehensible instantly to the meanest man.

The Protestants of to-day, among themselves, are on ground quite as shaky as that which lies under the Catholics. I am told that the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America bars out the Unitarians because they do not believe in the trinity. Well, why should they believe in it? I can find no proof that Jesus himself ever heard of it. To be sure, there are passages in the New Testament, as we have it to-day, which indicate the contrary, but what competent scholar holds that they are authentic? If they are, then why did Paul and the rest continue to baptize in the name of Jesus alone? Again, what reason is there to believe that Jesus believed in the dogmas of original sin? Or in that of the virgin birth? Or in the hell of the Protestant theologians? All these things were invented by men who came after him, and not many of them, I suspect, were men of the sort he would have cared to know.

The only possible basis for Christian unity, it seems to me, is the basis of common acceptance of the teachings of Jesus — that and no more. I see little chance of ever bringing it about. The reason thereof lies in the fact that, of all men, theologians are the most stubborn. They never sit down calmly and rationally to discuss the doctrines that they teach; they simply heave damnations at whoever ventures to question them. They are the implacable enemies of all sober and judicious thought, and of all decency between man and man. Perhaps such critics as Dr. Ainslie, by exposing their follies to every eye, may induce a few of them to return to reason, but the overwhelming majority, I am convinced, are hopeless. Theology attracts naturally the most vain and hateful sort of men, and they will not give up easily their franchise to harry and addle the rest of us. They have almost ruined Christianity as it is, and they will probably not stop until they have finished the job.

As to the question whether the actual teachings of Jesus would suffice for modern man — on that I hesitate to express an opinion. It may be that they are too soft for the world we live in — that a civilization grounded on the beatitudes simply could not exist. I am inclined to suspect that that may be true, but I am not sure. At all events, it might be well to try. The religion of Jesus, despite the efforts of theologians to corrupt it, has left a brilliant mark upon human history, and most men have come to believe in some parts of it, if not in all of it. I think it might be interesting to try the whole. But before that may be done, the entire race of Christian theologians must be got rid of, and that looks to me to be very difficult.

H. L. MENCKEN.

FURTHER PROGRESS IN CHURCH UNION IN SOUTH INDIA

BY REV. JOHN J. BANNINGA, D.D.
President South India United Church, Pasumalai, South India

ANOTHER step has been taken in the church union negotiations that are going on in South India. The joint committee composed of representatives of the church of England in India, the Wesleyan Methodist church in South India and the South India United church met in the city of Madras, February 26 to March 8, 1929, and there completed their draft of the "proposed scheme of union." It is nine years since this committee began its work. The meeting in Madras was the eighth meeting of the committee. A previous meeting was held in Bangalore in July, 1928, and that meeting was reported in *The Christian Union Quarterly*. The meeting in Madras completed the work that was begun at Bangalore.

Throughout all the meetings until now certain fundamental principles had been taken up for discussion and suggested solutions of the difficulties involved and were reported to the churches. When the churches had considered these matters the committee again met and tried to remove objections found in their work by the various churches. The problem of the ministry had been perhaps the most difficult problem to deal with and several solutions had been proposed and rejected by one or the other of the churches, sometimes by all the churches. This was especially true of the commissioning service which was suggested in the fourth meeting. On the one hand the Anglicans felt that this commissioning service was not an ordination service and, therefore, could not be accepted. On the other hand, the members of the South India United Church felt that it was so like an ordination service that they could not accept it. Hence the committee had to find another solution. The same was true of the problem of intercommunion as well as of other minor problems such as "voting by houses" and "the place of the laity in the church."

But coming back again and again to these problems after thorough discussion in the various churches and after further study and consultation among themselves, the committee did grow into a unity and into a fellowship that made it possible for them to view these problems with a united mind and to find a solution which was in no sense the least common denominator of what all believed, but which, to them at least, appeared to be the plan that must be in the mind of God regarding the unity of his church.

The nature and spirit of the meetings in Madras were quite different from those of former meetings. It was to all who were present a real spiritual experience. No one tried to gain anything for his side. All seemed intent on finding the best for all. Each rejoiced in the contribution that others were making and the whole impression left upon the minds of those who were present was that God's Spirit was among them working in their minds and hearts to make his will known and they, therefore, with far more confidence than after any previous meeting, place their findings before the churches and ask for their careful and prayerful consideration and acceptance.

It may be asked what was the further progress that was made? The answer would probably include the following as some of the steps that had been taken.

First of all the *spiritual character of the church* is emphasized in a way that it had not been emphasized before. For instance, in Section II (3) it is stated

> "the result of union should be not merely greater fellowship and peace within the church and greater eagerness for the proclamation of the gospel of Christ, but also a greater release of divine power and greater effectiveness for the establishment of his kingdom on earth."

In Section III we find these expressed:—

> "this unity of the spirit must find expression in the faith and order of the church in its worship, in its organization, and its whole life."

So also in the paragraphs regarding the membership of the church and the ministry of the church it is clearly shown that the spiritual side of the Christian life is emphasized over and over again and the whole document has been permeated by an atmosphere of spiritual life such as was not found in any previous report of the committee.

In the second place there is *clearer statement regarding the ministry.* The definition of the ministry is as follows:—

> "The ministry is a gift of God through Christ to his church; that God himself calls men into the ministry through his holy Spirit, and that their vocation is to lead God's people in worship, prayer and praise, and through pastoral ministrations, the preaching of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments (all these made effective by faith) to assist men to receive the saving and sanctifying benefits of Christ and to fit them for service; and they believe that in ordination God, in answer to the prayer of his church, bestows on and assures to those whom he has called and his church has accepted for any particular form of the ministry a commission for it and the grace appropriate to it, which grace, if humbly used, will enable the ministers to perform the same."

The ministry of the church is further considered under two heads, "the ordained ministry" and the "unordained ministry." Under the ordained ministry, we find (1) bishops, (2) presbyters, and (3) deacons. The bishops shall be and will have "general pastoral oversight of all Christian people of the diocese and more particularly of the ministers of the church in the diocese." The bishops will in all matters be guided by the written constitution, and will "perform their functions in accordance with the customs of the church, those functions being named and defined in the written constitution." They will be presidents of the diocesan councils and will be especially charged with oversight of the faith of the church. They will have no control over the finance of the diocese. They will be appointed for life but in case of grave unsuitability to the work may be removed from office.

It is the special function of presbyters to be dispensers of the word of God and of the sacraments and to administer discipline in accordance with rules and it is the rule of the church that none other except the bishop and the presbyter shall have the right to celebrate the holy Communion. Rules are laid down for the presbyters and their duties are defined. All ordained ministers in the uniting churches will be ministers of the word and sacrament in the united church and will have full official standing in the courts of that church.

The office of deacons is also retained in the united church, but the committee was not satisfied that it has found the final solution of the problem of the diaconate. The constitution provides for lay deacons or elders as well as for ordained deacons and the difference is that ordained deacons are regarded as probationers for the presbyterate, whereas the elders or lay deacons are regarded as laymen appointed to help both in the spiritual and temporal affairs of the church.

In addition to the elders or lay deacons several other lay workers are mentioned such as preachers, stewards, deaconesses, etc., and throughout the document there is a new emphasis on their responsibilities and their opportunities for service in the church. All the members negotiating for union felt that this point must be thoroughly understood and clearly expressed in the "proposed scheme" for the church of Christ does not merely consist of the ministers of the church, but consists of all the members and the members must take their due place in all the activities of the church. This was true in the early church and has always been true in every age when the church was performing its functions properly, and, therefore, the committee felt that the united church must also avail itself of this great body of workers and try to make them feel that they were an integral and responsible part of the church and all its activities.

The final authority in the church is the synod. Under the synod there will be diocesan councils and under the diocesan councils pastorate committees; the latter will have charge of all the work within a pastorate which may consist of several parishes, but all of which will be under one presbyter who will be chairman of the pastorate committee. From the pastorate committees representatives will go to the diocesan councils. The bishop will be chairman of this council and the membership will consist of both ministers and laymen, the number to be determined by the constitution of each council. From the councils representatives will go to the synod and all the affairs of the church will be in the charge of the synod. A moderator will be elected for a term of years and an executive committee will have *ad interim* control of the work between meetings of the synod. "The synod is the supreme and governing and legislative body of the united church and final authority in all matters pertaining to that church."

An interesting problem that arose in the negotiations was that of "voting by houses." This has been the custom in the Anglican church, but not in the other negotiating churches. When the matter was referred to the councils of the South India United church every council voted definitely against the principle of "voting by houses." It was felt that neither bishops nor ministers nor laymen voting by themselves should be able to control the legislation of the church. But that all the representatives of the church acting conjointly after thinking together on the problem should vote together with reference to any particular matter that might come before the synod or councils. It was provided, however, that,—

> "When any proposition (in which term are included proposed enactments, statements, and resolutions, and also forms of public worship) is brought before the synod which directly concerns
>
> (*a*) the faith and doctrine of the church,
> (*b*) the conditions of membership in the church,
> (*c*) the functions of the ordained ministers of the church, or
> (*d*) the worship of the church, and any forms of worship proposed for general use in the church, the matter shall be discussed in the synod in the usual manner, but the proposition shall be submitted to the synod for final voting thereon only in a form approved by the bishops sitting separately for that purpose.

> "The proposition when thus placed before the synod may be discussed, and, if desired, be referred back to the bishops for further consideration and possible modification.
>
> "Such a proposition shall be declared to have been passed only if it obtains a two-thirds majority (or three-quarters, in the case referred to in Chapter XIII A of this constitution) of the number of members of the synod present and voting.
>
> "At any stage of its discussion, such a proposition may be referred by the synod to the diocesan councils for their opinions."

It was felt that this provision would meet the objections on both sides and, inasmuch as there will be few occasions when such matters are voted upon by the synod or councils, it would be well under such circumstances to allow those who have made special study of these matters to draft the final resolutions.

It must be clearly understood that none of the three churches has as yet voted on this "proposed scheme." The process through which it must go now is that the "proposed scheme" will be reported by each of the three committees to their highest legislative bodies and these bodies will then probably refer the "proposed scheme" to the church councils in the case of the South India United church; and to the general synod in England in the case of the Wesleyan church; and to the diocesan councils concerned in India and to the Lambeth Conference in England on the part of the Anglican church. When these bodies have reported the highest legislative body in each church will again take up the matter and make some final decision with regard to the proposals. It is hoped by the members of the joint committee that each church will at least tentatively approve of the "proposed scheme." If there are any details that any church thinks need consideration these might be referred back to the joint committee for alteration. It hardly seems likely that any final action can be taken within three years inasmuch as some of the bodies that must deal with this matter meet only once in two years.

The joint committee has throughout these nine years given a great deal of time and consideration to the problems involved.

The members of the committee have frequently met with one another and have there, under the guidance of the holy Spirit as they believed, deliberated concerning these matters and come more or less to a common mind. They feel that the churches must now go through the same process. No church in isolation and no group of church members meeting in isolation can study these proposals properly. Joint conferences of the ministers and members of the churches will be necessary, so that the members of each church may know fully what the members of the other churches think concerning these matters. One such joint conference has already been held at Pasumalai where not less than 250 representatives of the three churches came together and deliberated for five days concerning the provisions of the "proposed scheme." It was most interesting to see how a common mind developed in the course of these days and at the end there were less than a half dozen people present who did not believe that this "proposed scheme" would be a satisfactory basis for the union of the churches. A good many had come to the conference with doubts in their minds, but fellowship together both in deliberation and in worship showed them that we were already united in most matters and, therefore, could go safely forward and become one church with one organization though with a great variety of life and worship. It is the hope and prayer of those concerned in South India that this union will not mean merely the amalgamation of three small bodies in South India, but that if this union takes place there may be at once an extension of this union, so that within a few years' time there will be one united church for the whole of India including practically all Christians except those belonging to the Roman Catholic and Syrian churches and that, thereafter, union movements will also succeed in other countries so that within a very short period of time there may be all round the world a great union of those who call themselves the followers of Jesus Christ and who find in him the word of God and salvation from sin. This is a consummation devoutly to be wished and the prayers of all Christians are requested to that end.

John J. Banninga.

ESSENTIALS OF THE REFORMED FAITH AND SYSTEM TO BE CONSERVED IN PROPOSED CHURCH UNIONS

BY PRESIDENT GEORGE W. RICHARDS
Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States, Lancaster, Pa., and President of the Council of the Reformed Churches Throughout the World Holding to the Presbyterian System

One of the memorable moments in the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order (1927) was the declaration of Archbishop Germanos. He spoke for the delegates of the Orthodox church saying: "We have concluded with regret that the bases assumed by the foundation of the reports which are to be submitted to the vote of the conference are inconsistent with the principles of the Orthodox church which we represent. . . . "In consequence, while we, the undersigned Orthodox representatives, must refrain from agreeing to any reports other than that upon the message of the church, which we accept and are ready to vote upon, we desire to declare that in our judgment the most which we can now do is to enter into coöperation with other churches in the social and moral sphere on a basis of Christian love."

We may differ widely from the faith and order of oriental Orthodoxy, but we must concede with admiration that its representatives know what they believe and have both courage and courtesy to declare it.

The churches of the Alliance of the Reformed Churches holding to the Presbyterian System, were represented by men no less devout and scholarly than those of the church of the orient, but they did not speak as a group with the same authority and unanimity of their faith and order which they hold in common.

One thing is certain, the fathers and founders of the Reformed churches always professed faith in one holy catholic church. They were deeply grieved by sect and schism and they worked and prayed for the restoration of the unity of the church.

I shall cite only two passages of many that might be selected from their writings. Calvin spoke of the divisions in the church as a "frightful mutilation of Christ's body" and he ardently desired "to maintain the church universal in its unity, which malignant minds have always been eager to dissever." In letters written to Melancthon and Bullinger, he expressed a hope similar to that which he wrote to Cranmer,—the hope of "a weighty consensus of learned men properly composed according to the standard of the Scriptures by which churches otherwise far separated may be brought to unity." To achieve this he considered it wicked on his part to evade any labors or arrangements, even to the extent of crossing ten seas.

Almost a century after Calvin's letter to Cranmer, the Westminster fathers, when the Scotch commissioners had taken their seats in the assembly, met with the House of Commons (September 25, 1643) in St. Margaret's church, Westminster, and took the solemn league and covenant, including the vow as follows: "We shall endeavor to bring the churches of God in the three kingdoms to the nearest conjunction and uniformity in religion, confession of faith, forms of government, directory for worship, and catechising that we and our posterity after us, may, as brethren, live in faith and love, and the Lord may delight to dwell in the midst of us."

In the Catechism of Geneva (1545) is the following question: "What is meant by the term catholic or universal?" The answer is: "It teaches us that as all believers have one head, so shall all of them grow together as one body, so that there may be one church, spread over the whole earth, not many churches."

The Lausanne Conference was clearly not a hastily invented device of the present generation, but a somewhat belated answer to the prayers and purposes of the Reformers of the 16th and 17th centuries.

I

The question for us to consider is: *What have the churches of the Alliance of the Reformed Churches holding to the Presbyterian System in common that ought to be conserved in proposals for church union?* True, they may not have been able, during the last quadrennium, to prepare and submit for adoption a consensus creed; yet they must have something of faith and order that is definite and definable in the presence of churches of other types and of the modern world with its new ways of thinking and living.

Once the trumpet of our founders gave forth no uncertain sound. Men with conviction, born of living faith in the word of God, spoke from the land of the Alps, the caves and forests of France, the Rhine provinces of Germany, the Dutch lowlands, and the Scotch highlands. They raised the voice of protest not only against Roman Catholicism, but against Lutheranism, Anabaptism, Anglicanism, mysticism, and Socinianism. They made covenants, built churches, wrote confessions, adopted church orders, fought battles, lived courageously, and died heroically for their faith. The council of Geneva declared to the messengers of Savoy: "For the sovereignty of God we shall risk our lives."

It is possible that the original differences among the five or six types of Protestantism have been outlived, that the distinctive things in the faith and order of the Reformed churches have faded into the light of common day. Men, like Dean Inge, tell us that "the influence of Calvin seems to be everywhere on the decline." Of course one might say, with equal show of reason, that the Bible everywhere has lost its authority. It is possible that the new Protestantism has made uncouth the old Protestantism of Zwingli, Calvin, Knox, Olevianus, Ursinus, and the Westminster divines. Perchance we are now sailing under the star of Schleiermacher, Ritschl, and Troeltsch. Doumergue may be right when he tells us that "the modern times do not come from the Reformation, that they come rather from Semler, Lessing, rationalism, and Anabaptism, in so far as they are contrary to the Reformers and evangelical Christianity."

In the face of these possibilities Professor Barth says in an address on "The Task of the Reformed Churches": "One of the few real services which the German Reformed churches might perhaps perform to-day for their confessional brethren of the west would be to recall them, after we have recalled ourselves, to the fact that in spite of all our temporal needs and seeming necessities, the Reformed churches are in possession of something peculiarly their own." There may be more method in the madness of the German professor than we at first hearing are willing to allow; and if so, what things do the Reformed churches possess that are "peculiarly their own"?

In his loyalty to the faith of the fathers one need not become an apologist for the theology of John Calvin, though I am inclined to think that if he were living now he would not be wafted to and fro by every wind of doctrine, of which no one can tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth. He was the last among his contemporaries to claim infallibility or finality. Indeed one need not become a defiant defender of the 16th and 17th century confessions of faith — the Helvetica Prior or Posterior, the Heidelberg Catechism, the Articles of Dort, the Westminster Standards; though, when they are discarded by so-called enlightened men to-day with a supercilious sneer, it reminds one of poodle dogs barking at the heels of Newfoundlanders. The authors of these statements of faith always regarded them as human attempts to put into reasonable phrase the eternal gospel of God revealed in his prophets and in his Son Jesus Christ. Confession and revelation were not taken to be equivalent; room was allowed for new light to break from the fontal source of truth and for old confessions to give way to new revelations.

Yea, the leaders of our churches were not bond-slaves even to the letter of the Scriptures, like some of their descendants became; they lived in the power of its spirit of which the letter was only the vehicle. Zwingli never wearies of reiterating, in his commentary on *True and False Religion,* the words of Jesus: "It is the spirit that giveth life; the flesh profiteth nothing." One of his outstanding passages in the same work is the following: "Yet what is heard is not the very word of God which causes us to believe, for if we were rendered faithful by that which is read and heard evidently all of us should be faithful. . . . But we observe that many both hear and see yet have not faith. It is clear, then, that we are rendered faithful only by that word which the heavenly Father proclaims in our hearts, by which also he illumines us so that we understand and draws us that we follow."

We should consider primarily the Reformers' point of view, their attitude and disposition toward the ultimate realities, the direction in which they looked and in which they were headed. They had the upward look and they were headed Godward. In his light they professed to see light—the light that shone from him who dwelleth in light unapproachable, shone into the hearts of prophets, blazed in an effulgence of glory from his incarnate Son Jesus Christ, and radiates from the word of the Scripture. Walking in the light they felt themselves to be in fellowship "with all saints who are scattered over the whole earth and through all the ages, yet bound together by the Spirit and doctrine of Christ, cherishing unity of faith and the oneness of purpose of brethren." To follow their spirit not their letter may lead us beyond fundamentalism, which someone declares to be Christianity in petrifaction, and beyond modernism which the same writer describes as Christianity in dissolution. We may reach a higher position and rise above the rigidity of the one and the fluidity of the other; and, with firm faith in the eternal gospel of God, we may enjoy the glorious liberty of the sons of God. We may find, what the fathers discovered, the living word through the written word which is a direct revelation from the living God through his Son, rather than a mystic emergence into human consciousness of the ground or essence of an evolving universe.

II

The reason for the distinctive faith and order of the various churches is the *difference in their idea of God,*—his relation to the world, the way of imparting and appropriating and apply-ing the blessings of salvation. True, they confess the same God, the God of the Old Testament and the New, the God of the Nicene creed; but when they repeat the same words they mean different things. Indeed, the original Reformers found themselves differing so widely from one another that they were constrained, in order to be true to themselves and their God, to dwell apart in separate communions.

The God of Catholicism is conceived, after the analogy of a Byzantine monarch, as far removed from men in spirit and in space. Men find access to him only through divinely authorized officers and institutions, through a mediating hierarchy. His truth is formulated into dogmas and his grace is infused through sacraments; both of which are in control of his chosen servants, the bishops, and are received in passive submission by the people. It is a blend of the imperial and the sacramental idea of God; the latter is allied to the Greek view of deity, described by Professor Stawell (*Quarterly Review,* January, 1927): "For the God who dies is always reborn and by sacramental communion the worshippers can draw his nature into theirs, share in his sufferings and have hope in his resurrection." The church of Christ, in this view, is a sacramental community, which, as by magic, is sustained by supernatural nourishment.

The Reformers separated from Catholicism because they had a new vision of God and found a new way by which God gave salvation to men and men received salvation from God. They re-discovered grace and truth as revealed in Jesus Christ and a new way of access through him to God. Therefore, they *united* in protest against Catholicism; but they *divided* on their definitions of the blessings of redemption. Controversy began and was waged with bitterness on the means of grace, the appropriation of salvation, the significance of the sacraments. Because they could not agree on this point, Luther and Zwingli separated at Marburg, this year four hundred years ago, never to meet again. Both the original Reformers, however, stood aloof from the Anabaptists and the mystics. Calvin and Melancthon denounced the Socinians. All these men and groups were biblicists, but they found widely different conceptions of God and salvation in the Bible. They were under the power of great convictions and, against their own will, they were driven to divide the holy catholic church. Until these divisive convictions are superseded by greater uniting convictions, the union of churches will not be vital and free but mechanical and forced.

The churches belonging to this council once claimed to be in a unique sense the church re-formed according to the word of God—*die nach Gottes Wort reformirte Kirche.* The sovereignty of God, as revealed in his word, became the molding principle of Reformed doctrine, worship, polity, and piety. The founders, Zwingli and Calvin, proclaimed with irresistible enthusiasm the God of the prophets, God incarnate in Jesus Christ, God "in action," determining, in his righteousness and love, the destiny of men and nations, ruling the universe for his redemptive purposes. They worshipped him as Father and King, as Savior and Judge.

In the words of the Heidelberg Catechism, "The eternal Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who of nothing made heaven and earth, with all that in them is, who likewise upholds and governs the same by his eternal counsel and providence, is for the sake of Christ his Son my God and my Father, in whom I so trust as to have no doubt that he will provide me with all things necessary for body and soul; and further, that whatever evil he sends upon me in this vale of tears, he will turn to my good; for he is able to do it, being Almighty God, and willing, also, being a faithful Father."

The Westminster Shorter Catechism says: "God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth."

The God of our fathers transcends the universe yet he is not separated from it in such a way as not to be in full control of it. He is not an unfinished God, a God in the making evolving with the world. He is in the world yet in such a way as not to be entangled with it and in a manner subject to it. He works through the world to realize the reign of righteousness and love in the hearts of men and yet he does not limit himself to material or personal agencies in his redemptive activity. He works where and when and how he pleases. He is not an absolute substance into which men are merged by mystic ascent, or that is infused into our nature as a sort of medicine of immortality by sacramental transactions; nor is he submerged in the world in such a way that the distinction between creature and creator is lost. He is not mere immanent will or reason which becomes self-conscious in men and is progressively apprehended by men and recorded in the religious literature of the white and colored races.

To distinguish him from justifiable endeavors, to define him in modern terms and to make him more palatable to modern minds, I should say that he is more than "the immaterial reality,' "the principle of concretion," "the sum total of the forces of the universe," "the behavior of the universe," "creative coördination," "will functioning through the world as becoming," "that feature of our total environment which most vitally affects the continuance and welfare of human life."

In view of these various conceptions of God, some underlying the faith and order of other churches and others at present current among scientists and philosophers, it is my conviction that the Reformed churches have a message to the world to-day — a God to proclaim that men can trust, work with, hope in, love and live for.

Let us remember that we are not immovably bound to the metaphysical definitions of God in our Reformed confessions; God is more than these. They half conceal and half reveal him. We need not surrender, however, the God who is revealed in the word of Scriptures for the vague impersonal being whom the scientists and philosophers offer as an improved substitute for the God of the Bible. We concede that these definitions have relative value but they offer us no gospel.

Even the Scriptures are only an earthen vessel containing the heavenly treasure. The letter killeth; the spirit maketh alive. Yet we should keep in close touch with the letter that through it, as through a *revelatio specialis,* not as through one of the many records of the spiritual experiences of the race, God may speak to our age and condition as he spoke in times past to the prophets and the apostles. We may need to put his revelation to us through his word into new phrases but we shall not come closer to him and see him more clearly by ceasing to be the church of the word.

One may say that all the religions, and especially each of the churches, believe that God is sovereign. But who or what is their sovereign God. Is he the supreme being of Confucius, of the Brahmans or of the Gita, of the Parsees or of the Mohammedans, of the philosophers or of the scientists, of the mystics or of the artists, of the African savage or the cultured European? Each of these groups bow in reverence before a sovereign being.

The Reformed churches have found the sovereign God solely in the word of God. How do we reach this knowledge of God? is asked in the Genevan Catechism. The answer is: "Through the word that he gave us which is the door into his heavenly kingdom." "This word," we are told, "is contained in the holy Scriptures." Yet, here again, the question arises what is the word of God and how is it to be interpreted? The different answers to this question also have divided the church.

The Reformed churches do not accept the Oriental Orthodox theory of a final and infallible statement of divine revelation in the Nicene creed and in the decrees and canons of the seven ecumenical councils. Nor will they submit to the decisions of the vicar of Christ at Rome, whose definitions are said to be in themselves "irreformable." Zwingli in his *True and False Religion,* says: "It is, therefore, madness and utter impiety to put enactments and decrees of certain men and councils upon an equality with the word of God."

The Reformed churches will not be content, even, if they are true to the ideals of the founders, with the confessional statements of the 16th and 17th centuries as the ultimate formulation of their faith. They protested then, and they ought to protest now, against the visions and fancies of Anabaptists and mystics, either as superseding, or as being on an equality with, the Scriptures. Nor are they ready to concede that the Christian consciousness, the enlightened reason, or erudite exegetical scholarship alone are sufficient to interpret the revelation of the Bible. The very words of Jesus imbedded in the synoptic narrative, even if they could be restored beyond the possibility of doubt, are not an adequate guide to the truth of faith. They help us to see Jesus according to the flesh, but not according to the spirit.

The Reformed churches are the churches of the word; they follow not the letter, but the spirit, of the word. Their last appeal is to the *testimonium internum spiritus sancti,* a testimony given not apart from the Scriptures, but through the Scriptures to the heart of man which believeth unto righteousness.

Calvin says in the Institutes (111. viii; 1): "Christian philosophy bids reason withdraw itself in order that it may give place to the holy Spirit and be subject to his guidance so that man no longer lives of himself, but has Christ living and reigning in him."

In his reply to Sadolet he adds: "The Christian faith must not be based on human testimony, not be supported by uncertain opinions, not be undergirded by things that appear as believable, but it must be written upon the heart by the finger of the living God, so that no error can cover it with anything that will deceive us."

"Accordingly one has not a trace of Christ who does not hold fast to the following fundamental facts; God alone illuminates our minds with a knowledge of the truth and with his spirit seals it in our hearts and fixes our conscience through his confirmation of the spirit."

The word of God accordingly is not to be explained by the common sense of the untutored man or by the philosophical and historical knowledge of the trained exegete — both of these have relative value and are indispensable. We need in addition to them the illumination of the Spirit of God; for spiritual things are spiritually discerned. The Genevan Catechism says: "We must embrace it (the Scriptures) with firm conviction of the heart as truth come from heaven; must keep ourselves docile, subject the heart and mind in obedience to it, must love it with the heart; must let it grow into our hearts with firm roots, so that it be formed after its pattern, so that it will attain its purpose, i.e., our salvation." If, as some claim, we have found a more excellent way to the truth of God, then the Reformed churches have little or nothing to conserve in a re-united church.

The Reformed churches primarily strive to make the will of God prevail in worship, government, and life. The word, as spirit and life, is the fontal source of the faith upon which the church is built; faith comes through the hearing of the word and is confirmed, not begotten, by the use of sacraments. The Catholic Church on the contrary claims that the church has produced and controls the word, which is true only of the written word; not of the incarnate word. Unless the Reformed churches continue to live, move, and have their being in the word, are constantly reformed according to the word — *nach Gottes Wort reformirt,* they can no longer claim to be "reformed."

A Reformed congregation is a fellowship of men and women who believe themselves to be elect of God — chosen to do his will, elect to glorify God by serving their fellowmen. It is not a community of persons seeking to save themselves with laws and ordinances which God has provided through the church as an institution of salvation. It is not a fellowship merely of men and women who believe themselves to have been justified by grace alone; not a company of converted souls who have been suddenly transformed into sinless saints by the immediate action of the Spirit; not a school of sound doctrine and pure morals in which Jesus is master and example and the Bible is the text book on theology and ethics. A congregation of the Reformed faith and order is the community of persons called to do the will of God in all the relations of life, called to be co-workers with him in the transformation of the world, not by might nor by power but by his spirit. Here is a moral motive and a world-transforming dynamic more compelling than Kant's categorical imperative thou shalt; than the command of the Greek oracle, "Know thyself"; or of the mystic, submerge thyself; or of the modern idealist, realize thyself; or of the patriot, live for thy country; or of the humanitarian, serve thy fellowmen. Greater than any one, or all, of these motives of life and action, and comprehending all of them, is the imperative of the Reformed churches, glorify God! How shall we glorify him? Let our great Reformer answer: "By putting our whole trust in him, by obedience to his will, by calling upon him in every need which he offers, seeking from him deliverance and all good, and that with heart and mouth we confess him as the only source and origin of all good"; in short, if we are to live right among men in time, we must live for God in eternity.

The Reformed churches, like the Episcopalians and unlike the Lutherans and Anabaptists, regard the ministry as an ordinance of God prescribed in the New Testament, to which their founders turned not only for their faith, but also for their order — both presumably were revealed by God through Christ and the apostles. They differed from the episcopal theory of the ministry in declaring the ministry to be but one order and not three orders — one office with diverse functions.

The moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1917, said in a closing address: "For the rest, the Church of Scotland stands with all historic and catholic Christianity on the two broad fundamental principles: (a) that the Christian ministry is not a man-made thing, but is the gift to his church of the ascended Savior; and (b) that it is continued and can be continued only by the rite of ordination ministered in the power of his abiding Presence and his holy Spirit, by men who have been themselves ordained to it." One must recognize, of course, that there is in the Presbyterian, as well as in the Episcopal Church, a high church party and a low church party.

The Reformed churches were unlike the Lutheran churches because the latter, following Luther, did not consider either a distinct type of ministry or of church government to have been divinely instituted and set forth in the New Testament. Luther was congregational in his theory of church polity; he inferred from the doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers "that every Christian congregation had the right to test doctrine, call preachers, install and depose them."

The primary motive of the Calvinistic churches for the maintenance of their view of the ministry and of church government was the realization of the sovereignty of God's word in the church and the exclusion "of doctrines and commandments of men which are contrary to his word or beside it in matters of faith and worship." For this reason the minister of the word, not the priest; the pulpit, not the altar; the proclamation of the *favor dei,* the favor of God, not the sacramental infusion of grace — *gratia infusa;* take primary place in the worshipping congregation. The Reformed churches, therefore, cannot submit to the episcopate, claiming apostolic succession as essential to the being of the church and to a valid ministry, without denying the whole heritage for which their fathers paid so dearly.

Let it be clearly understood that we state the distinctive faith and order of the Reformed churches not in the spirit of intolerance, pride, or disparagement of doctrines and of institutions sacred to the other churches. There are some things that each church must hold fast; to give them up is to play false to a sacred trust. There are other things that each church must yield in the interest of unity; to hold fast to them is to turn a deaf ear to what the Spirit saith to the churches.

Yet we must guard against unions by compromise, which may lower the gospel of God to the level of men without lifting men to the level of the gospel. Peace among the churches may be obtained by tolerance that is born of indifference to biblical and denominational values. Calvin reminds Sadolet that "before men restored the gospel in its purity and simplicity there was no difference of opinion — rather peace and rest ruled everywhere." Let us beware of church union that brings peace and rest at the cost of ceasing to protest and to re-form the church according to the word of God.

I fear, also, ways of reunion that are too easy because they do not require a change of heart, but only a change of technique. If the churches would unite by the easy way of confirmation and ordination by bishops who are in apostolic succession, or of accepting the doctrine of the Lord's supper as defined in the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, in my opinion nothing would be gained save that Christians would be confirmed and ordained by bishops, or immersed by Baptist ministers, or admitted to Lutheran communion tables. There would be no actual advance in spirit and life, such an advance as would be made through the understanding of new truth and the operation of more grace and so lead men beyond medieval Catholicism, beyond 16th century Protestantism, into a new fellowship of faith and love in Christ Jesus, and thus compel the churches to unite as irresistibly as their former understanding of truth and grace compelled them to divide.

The Reformed churches have no "quadrilateral" to offer as a basis for reunion — no form of government, no confession of faith, no type of piety; in these things they have their preferences, but none of them is considered essential and final. As a basis of union far broader and deeper and more difficult to fulfil than any of the quadrilaterals that I have so far read, I submit the last paragraph in Calvin's reply to Sadolet:

> "God grant that thou, Sadolet, with all thine, mayest see that there is no other bond of church unity than the fact that Christ, the Lord, has reconciled us with God the Father and has gathered us out of the dispersion into the communion of his body, that so we may grow together through his Word and Spirit into one heart and soul."

George W. Richards.

WHAT IS A VALID MINISTRY FOR A UNITED CHURCH?

BY ALFRED C. GARRETT, PH. D.
Society of Friends, Logan, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

THE topic proposed is one which in the strict sense it is not possible for a member of the society of Friends to treat. I refer to the term "a *valid* ministry." Canon Quick of the church of England has distinguished between "valid sacraments" and "*efficacious* sacraments." A valid ministry, I believe, has reference to the correct ministration of the sacraments; and since the society of Friends does not use the outward signs of the sacraments, but holds to the inward grace of baptism of the holy Spirit, and of the communion of the body and blood of Christ conveyed into the heart by his Spirit, it might be not unjustly said that we have no part or lot in this matter. To quote the words of Canon Quick, "A valid sacrament is one in which all the appointed signs are duly performed," and a valid ministry presumably is one fully qualified according to the "appointed" means of the same tradition to administer "valid" sacraments. The nearest thing to a valid ministry that the Friends could advocate would be a ministry appointed directly by Christ himself, "by the mighty ordination of his pierced hands," to such spiritual efficacy as would bring hearers into the baptism of the holy Spirit and the communion of the Spirit. But this, strictly speaking, would be an efficacious rather than a "valid" ministry.

Again, I should confess to much unfamiliarity with usual ecclesiastical aspects of this subject, and trust this fact will not disturb the actual focal point of discussion which may be in the minds of the best informed. I am attempting a different approach,—not as usual from above downward but from below upward,—not from a high church point of view, whether the historic episcopate and ordination under it might not be the best or chief means of obtaining a ministry universally valid and efficacious; but from a low church point of view, whether the holy Spirit himself, the Spirit of Christ, the undoubted author of validity and efficacy be not, in his truest manifestations in ministry be the essential point of emphasis?

In pursuing the thought, let us hold in mind that the nature of the church is that of a spiritual organism, an organ of the Spirit, pervaded by the Spirit of Christ, its head, who is its life. *Still more should its ministry* then, the whole combined ministry of the universal reunited church, be a ministry of the Spirit, pervaded, called, and actuated in its ministering by the Spirit of Jesus; otherwise the ministry itself would not be part of the Body of Christ. And this principle is conceded, I believe, at least in theory, and in some form and degree, by nearly all parts of the Christian church. It is exceedingly impressive to me that the Anglican bishop of Bombay, speaking from the Anglo-catholic point of view, affirms that "in ordination, *Christ* ordains," and that "the person ordained is *the representative of Christ.*" The words could be used by the society of Friends; the basic principle is much the same. The divergence of course, appears when he adds that Christ ordains through the bishop,—"the bishop speaks for Christ in ordination." But here he means the living Christ, the Friends would simply say that Christ ordains a minister directly,—by his Spirit to-day without the hand of man.

Again, Professor Bulgakov, of the Orthodox church of Russia, representing the Eastern Catholic position, says also, "It is Christ himself who ordains his ministers." And Dr. Garvie, deputy chairman of the Lausanne conference, gave a definition of ordination which was taken to represent "the formula of union between Presbyterian and Congregational ministries," that "ordination is a corporate recognition of the grace-gift, investing with the authority of the church the exercise of that gift." And by this "grace-gift" is, of course, meant the "charism" which forms the "charismatic ministry." Finally, in that beautiful description of the experience of Protestant ordination by Dr. Banninga of the South India United church, whose address on the ministry was, to me, one of the most appealing of all the utterances heard at Lausanne; after alluding to the "grace-gift" as that in which "Christ bestows grace on (the young candidate) for the work that lies before him," the speaker went on to say that in the service of ordination, what the young man "feels above all else is that he is then and there in the very presence of the Master himself, and from him receives a special blessing which makes him in very reality 'God's man.' No church, no officer can make him such. It is a personal matter between him and his Master, and to the young man it is the Master himself who lays hands on him and bids him go forth in his name to proclaim salvation to all men through faith. It is, indeed, a solemn hour never to be forgotten, though all about the ceremony may be forgotten." This seems exceedingly similar to the position of the society of Friends, constituting one of our links to Protestantism.

There is then clearly a deep-seated harmony in the whole matter, in Catholic, Protestant, and Quaker, that "Christ himself ordains his ministers." Indeed, may it be too much to claim that practically all Christians agree on two fundamental points, that in the making of a minister, first it is the living Christ himself who calls and creates a minister by his gift of grace; and, secondly, that this gift is to be somehow considered and confirmed by his fellow Christians to assure its genuineness? This procedure is found even in the society of Friends, as in the others.

It is, of course, in this second sphere — the human side of the proceeding — that our differences mainly lie. But will it not prove true that as the great basic spiritual fact that "the living Christ ordains his own ministers himself" is emphasized and exalted among all Christians, the differences in the human actions which confirm this fact will come to seem less imperatively important, and while not removed, may be the better harmonized in the all-solvent love of the common Lord. The clue to unity then lies in the things of the Spirit, and the secret of an efficacious ministry for the whole lies in the presence and power of the Spirit throughout. Let us look at this a little more closely.

When St. Paul, in his great and final passage on the one church in Ephesians, fourth chapter, deals with the leadership of the church, this question of ministry, he emphasizes the varieties of ministry, in which rightly or wrongly our diversities began and in which they still so largely persist; but he presents this variety as that by which a great catholic unity is to be worked out. There is nothing wrong in diversity; and yet only that diversity is right in the church which is pervaded and harmonized by the Spirit of Christ the head. "Unto each of us was given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ (the 'grace gift'). . . . And he gave some to be apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers . . . . unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ, till we all attain unto the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the son of God." There is a surprising thing here: the concept of the church in the whole passage, and elsewhere in the epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, is of the most stupendous extent, not only catholic, but it anticipates a time when apparently the church will include all humanity, and more than that, all things whatsoever in heaven and in earth; and yet the ministry associated with this, and represented as producing it, is not at all of the catholic type. It is the primitive prophetic ministry. There is no mention of bishop, priest, or deacon, the three-fold ministry of church history, all which is conspicuously absent from Paul's great epistles, being only once barely mentioned in one of the latest of them, Philippians 1:1.

Instead of this, the ministry is of the charismatic type, as in all the assured epistles of Paul, where the inward grace, the grace-gift, the gift of the Spirit, was practically the whole matter, apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers, and others elsewhere;—all these worketh the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each one severally even as his will." (I Cor. 12:11.) Some say that these terms "prophet," etc., represent certain *functions* of the officers;

but evidence for this seems lacking. Was the mighty work of the Hebrew prophets, that sublimest succession of religious heroes in history, merely a *function* of some other office, as of the priesthood? Nay, verily. They were something for themselves (*sui generis*) ; with a few exceptions, they were prophets and nothing else, heralds of the King of kings. Nor were the prophets of the early Christian church, who were in the same prophetic succession, merely "functions" of bishop, priest, and deacon. They were the foremost ministry of the Pauline church and of the New Testament. How is it that all manner of Christians in continually referring to the New Testament, so seldom refer to this feature of it, in considering the ministry of a united church? And will not the modern church in all its branches be benefitted and led toward unity by again emphasizing the charismatic ministry of Paul's great united catholic church,—the Body of Christ of the epistle of the Ephesians? Since, as we have seen, our underlying unity lies in the things of the Spirit, is not a better harmony in the universal ministry also to be found in an increasing emphasis upon the ministry of the Spirit?

Now in all this it must not be understood that the more often mentioned offices and orders of church history are meant to be neglected, even those of bishop, presbyter, and deacon. They were surely present in the background of Paul's church,—at first, perhaps, under such terms as "helps, governments, rulers," and were themselves somewhat charismatic. Then from the epoch-making mention of Philippians 1:1, where Paul addresses for the first time in his epistles "the bishops (or overseers) and deacons," onward, we find them in ever increasing importance and power till they develop unto a catholic hierarchy. The priestly element has often been needed to balance the prophetic in religious history,—the overseers and elders of the primitive Pauline church, to counsel moderation to those of prophetic gifts, speakers with tongues, and so forth.

Even in the simple arrangements of the society of Friends in modern times,—a Christian group who have often been mistakenly said to have no organization,—(just as to my thinking they have wrongly been said to have no sacrament and no ordination),—we may recognize in the officers appointed, side by side with the ministers, to the work of eldership and oversight, a modern equivalent of those simply early offices which so soon developed into presbyter and bishop in the early church. Again, can we not see signs of a sort of genetic harmony through all these offices,—some of them more primitive and simple, earlier in the sequence of development; others more advanced in growth; some more partial, others more complete, but fundamentally parts or stages of the three-fold official ministry, and belonging to one single growth or living organism. Here again is a faint dawn of hope for unity, or at least for a "spiritual harmony" in all our diversities.

It may be objected that once more we have arrayed opposite each other the prophetic ministry and this official ministry. But both were in origin charismatic gifts of the one Spirit,—that links them together. They must no longer be in opposition. Both should again be recognized by all as indubitably "ordained by Christ," as they once more show clearly the evidences of his holy Spirit. There we shall have a yet wider and deeper "spiritual harmony" throughout the whole ministry of a united church,—a priest and prophet at last walking hand in hand!

For technical harmonization of the more charismatic gifts of preaching with the more official orders, we must look more closely at our problems.

It appears to be agreed since Lausanne that the ministry of the united church must be harmonized by having three elements accepted in peaceful combination, — the *episcopal* element, the *presbyterial* element and the *congregational* element. Since over three-fourths of the visible church is under an episcopal system in apostolic succession, this element obviously cannot by any means be left out of our thought. But how far down the line this episcopal ordination shall reach; how much of the ministry its extended hands shall cover, remains to be defined. Over against this system, a free prophetic ministry still seems to stand in some opposition. Now a wonderful attempt to adjust this relation of prophet and bishop was made by the Anglo-catholic bishop of Bombay in the (to me) epochal words, *"A prophet does not need to be ordained,"* a principle of profound historic insight. Had such a generous and irenic word been spoken in the early centuries, might not the schism of the Montanists have been prevented, and "the spiritual church" been saved to Catholicism? Taking it as he meant it, to refer to all Protestant ministry which does not come under the apostolic succession, provided only that it all shows the true signs and spiritual power of a prophet, his formula seems to me to contain great possibilities of harmony. Again, it calls mightily for an increase (in Protestantism especially, as in all the church) in the principle and concept of a charismatic ministry, in the interest of promoting unity.

The signs of a prophet, as of the presence of the Spirit in all ministry, should be the gifts and graces of the Spirit and the fruit of the Spirit,—and the fruitfulness as well.

Perhaps it may be claimed that I have not yet faced the real issue before us. Is the question really something like this? What kind of ministry,—(a ministry how ordained?)—shall be accepted for the celebration of the sacraments everywhere in the united church? The answer to such a question must be extremely difficult and only relative, because it depends so largely on the variable personal factor of how far we will tolerate one another's variations. A high-churchman, perhaps, would hardly wish to receive rites from a Free church minister. A statement made two years ago has been enlightening to me ever since. A speaker, being asked regarding the present situation of interchange of ministry with the Episcopal church, stated in substance, "England is ahead of the United States, and India is ahead of England, in such interchanges. In India they appear to have attained freedom and equality in interchange. In England the Free churches accepted the Lambeth quadrilateral which seems to include acceptance of the historic episcopate. Here in America we have apparently gotten only so far that the Episcopal church will accept other ministry for such functions as it actually does claim to include, e.g. (to illustrate from a different field) the Roman Catholic concept of ministry includes offering the sacrifice of the mass; others do not claim to include this function, and naturally could not be accepted to perform it. So of other ministries,—the Episcopal church can accept e. g. Methodist ministry to perform such functions as it claims to include, and would hope they would accept ours for what it claims to include." This suggests progress in detail; though the last clause apparently involves acceptance of the historic episcopate for the celebration of the eucharist.

The plan does not quite reach the point now sought for, which I take it is, not one kind of ministry, such as that under an apostolic succession for all celebration of sacraments,—but rather a combination or system of our diversities of ministries which would be everywhere or at least generally acceptable for that sacred service. A plan or principle outlined by Mr. Malcolm Spencer, a Free churchman with high church sympathies, in his admirable little book, *Impasse or Opportunity,* (p. 110) might be mentioned here. Speaking of the united church he says, "It will be in a very real sense a new body, having new powers, new spiritual faculties, new capacities for apprehending and serving Christ. The only authority which can fitly authorize any ministry in that body is a *new joint authority* in which new powers are vested. We should be misrepresenting the matter if we Free churchmen were to go *privatim et seriatim* to the bishops of the church of England for a supplementary episcopal commission to make good, as it were, the hypothecal defects of our ministry in the past. That would be an unworthy formality. We should go rather for the newly needed authorization to some newly constituted authority which would perforce include the bishops. I believe that the proposed united church of South India is thinking of following this method by which it will jointly recommission its ministry as a whole." This mention of "a new joint authority" for ordaining ministers calls our minds back to the conclusion of the Lausanne conference that the united church must contain three elements, the episcopal, the presbyterial, and the congregational. Would not that combination be the one to give joint authorization to ministry — to validate a system of ministry everywhere acceptable? And would they not come to use different forms of ordination,—i. e., forms authorizing different degrees of function, different scopes or service, ministers "claiming to include" different "functions," yet all authorized by this "new joint authority,"—some given full episcopal ordination, some in whom is given simply a recognition of the grace-gift with appropriate ceremonies,—finally, a recognition of the prophets purely such without any ceremony or any ordination? Here would be, not one ministry for the whole church perhaps, but one harmonious system of diverse ministries, authorized by the whole church, and accepted as widely as it claimed to function.

Can we further visualize a great central community church (in the best sense of that term) or "federated church," in each large community, in which by rotation, each kind of ministry should in course during the year celebrate the Lord's supper according to the mode of each, to which all kinds of Christians should gather to partake? The unifying effect of such a church would doubtless be enhanced if all the ministrants had received the authorization of a united church — a joint authority, as discussed above. Even the loyal member of the society of Friends could be present, entering in the fullest possible sense into the spiritual experience of partaking of the body and blood of Christ with his fellow Christians, even while *not* partaking of the bread and wine. As Mr. Spencer says, speaking for all Free-churchmen, "Behind the sacramental theory to which we cannot subscribe, there is a reality of *experience* which we can both understand and appreciate. May one not accept the fact and hold one's own theory to account for it?"

I understand that a church somewhat like the above in principle, and in the ministration of the Lord's supper, is that of the well-known English Free-churchman, Dr. Orchard, who it will be remembered accepted re-ordination by a bishop of the Old Catholic church. I am told by one who attended some of the services, that the Lord's supper is there ministered in three ways: first, as a memorial of the death of Christ; at another time, as under the apostolic succession, in the Anglican sense, and finally, as the sacrifice of the mass. Now if all who should partake in a community church such as above described should have the *experience* of which Mr. Spencer speaks, should all recognize the power of the inward spiritual grace as the essential benefit received, would they not all in the spirit of intercommunion and fraternal love, in time come to tolerate and receive one another's modes of ministration and confess efficacy and "spiritual validity" in all of these ministries? Such a situation everywhere received would be a "spiritually valid" ministry for a united church.

May I again quote Dr. Banninga at this point regarding what he apparently would regard as the true succession in ministry,—whether anyone would venture to claim it as his idea of "apostolic succession," or would name it "prophetic succession," it is surely the true spiritual succession,—"A stream of living water has flowed from the throne of grace in all ages. When the channel becomes blocked through the refusal of men to yield to the influences of the Spirit, the waters burst forth into new channels. And the evidences of the continuity of the stream is not in the banks of the old channels, but in the fact that there is living water, and that along the shores there is the evidence of the fruit that is produced by that living water."

Thus I have tried to suggest how, by an increasing emphasis upon the presence and work of Christ by his Spirit, or rather, perhaps, a more practical consciousness of his work, in the united church in our days, and especially as acting through a strongly and clearly charismatic ministry throughout all forms and orders, we might obtain a more harmonious, united and efficacious ministry,—a more *valid* ministry in whatever sense, especially a more "spiritually valid" ministry, everywhere in the church.

Do I really mean to emphasize the consciousness of that "radiant Christ" who indeed is the Head of the church, who in truth is the bishop of our souls, who must ordain all orders of our ministry? It is because of him that to me naturally, the valid and efficacious ministry everywhere and always is the ministry and the ministration of his Spirit.

ALFRED C. GARRETT.

CHURCH UNITY---THE WORLD'S NEED

BY FRANK A. HORNE

Methodist Episcopal Layman, Brooklyn, N. Y.

THE subject of church unity, up to this time, has been largely the concern of the clergymen; but, if it is to become a reality rather than an ideal, the laymen of our churches must be informed and enlisted. Men of affairs as well as the average churchman will respond when the matter is presented with all the implications involved and accompanied by definite proposals and specific objectives. There is a certain complacency about the existing situation and an inertia due to our inheritance of denominationalism which must be overcome. We have generally taken our church affiliations like our party politics from our parents and have regarded the fact of divisions in Christianity as something fixed and irrevocable. It has often been a matter of pride, boasting and even of supreme and exclusive loyalty "that we are not as other men are."

The laity, however, are not greatly concerned with ecclesiastical differences and traditional theologies and are, therefore, open to suggestions looking to spiritual efficiency and vital Christianity. Their training has not bound them to the past and their relation to the church organization is not of a professional or official character.

It is, therefore, as a layman representing the rank and file of the churches that I write, hoping and praying that the present movement toward church unity which is on, will develop into a sweeping current of conviction and action that will embrace all classes in our churches, clergy and laity alike.

Great leaders in big business that have shown such constructive, intelligent, and courageous imagination in the organization and successful operation of large corporate units, which now occupy so prominent a place in commerce and industry, could and should be enlisted by the church, in working out the program of effective organic mergers. It is significant that the highest ethical standards and fine expressions of social consciousness in human welfare are found to-day in the big industrial and banking organizations of our country, and we, therefore, should not fear large Christian organizations because of apprehended evils, provided the basic principles are thorougly Christian. If our vital Christianity is not sufficient to meet the test which the administration of a large united church organization will impose, it would be an indication of its failure to accomplish its ultimate task and perform its world wide mission.

The present *rapprochement* of the churches really represents a new epoch in church history. The course of events from the simplicity and beauty of the early church as instituted by Christ and the first disciples to the present day has been for the most part a record, unhappy and distressing, and indicates what might have been if Christ's way of unity and service had been followed through the centuries. What has been really accomplished is a miracle of grace and a demonstration of our divine religion. The succeeding epochs were the periods of the Roman and Greek churches; but, having lost their power because of imperialistic, political, and pagan accretions, the Reformation became inevitable. Then came the era of divisions, schisms, persecutions, and church wars which arose because of the bitterness and enmities of those sad days. The next great period was characterized by chasms and controversies. Intolerance and persecution still remained. Strife and combat both mental and physical between Catholics and Protestants, Gentiles and Jews, and among the denominations in our own country continued down to less than a century ago. We have now come to the more happy day and new epoch of coöperation and conference. Lausanne was a fine testimony of the new spirit and the brotherly attitude.

The idea of unity is elemental in real Christianity. It is an essential of victory and success in any field. In its train are such great conceptions and attitudes as brotherhood, understanding, fellowship, good-will, tolerance, and progress. The opposite, division, which has characterized the Christian church so long, connotes defeat and failure. Division is the precursor of misunderstanding, separation, antagonism, competition, controversy, intolerance, and disaster.

In considering church unity, the world's need, emphasis at once is placed on the need of to-day and to-morrow. The need of yesterday is passed and gone and cannot be met. Too often discussion and differences with regard to unity, which deals with the present and future, have been altogether centered on the past. The world's need, therefore, should be our compelling motive and the appealing call for action and relief should lead us to compose our differences, overcome our difficulties, growing out of old traditions and forms, and make a fresh start to deal with the present world and its problems.

The greatest need of the world to-day is a spiritual need and yet the greatest spiritual agency in the world, the church of Christ, with its over two hundred divisions, is impotent in adequately meeting this need. Dr. Peter Ainslie in his recent book, *The Scandal of Christianity,* says:

> "It must be borne in mind that the whole church believes in God, in Jesus Christ, in the holy Spirit, and in the Scriptures. Whatever is below these is in the field of possible differences, and in this field Christians have roamed to the scandal of Christianity. The scandal has not been in differing over these secondary matters, for there must always be diversity of opinion in any permanent unity, but the scandal has been in making the differences occasions for unbecoming behaviour of one group of Christians toward another group of Christians."

Again Dr. Ainslie says:

> "If any one's denominational position separates him from other Christians or forbids other Christians to join his church unless they conform to his interpretations, or forbids them to come to the Lord's supper because they are not of the same denomination, . . . there is something wrong in that attitude because it is shot through with prohibitions against other Christians."

The spiritual need of the church itself is unity. This must be met before it can minister in full measure to the spiritual need of the world it serves.

The evangelization of the world and the Christianizing of society are the greatest needs which challenge the church of our day. But a divided church can accomplish neither and the attempt to export our denominational distinctions to non-Christian lands is a reproach to our Christianity and a denial of the great commission. The rise of indigenous churches in mission fields with the emphasis upon unity and nationalism which is so apparent and natural is fraught with momentous possibilities of good and ill. The young churches overseas will not wait upon our laggard movement toward unity at the home base, but will shame us by quick action and organic combinations. At the same time national churches will be promoted with the evils of a new religious body and the tendency to emphasize patriotism and nationalism as against a world encircling Christianity.

Dr. Rufus M. Jones in a paper presented at the Jerusalem Missionary Conference on "Secular Civilization and the Christian Task," points out "that the greatest rival of Christianity in the world is not Mohammedanism, or Buddhism, or Hinduism or Confucionism, but a world-wide secular way of life and interpretation of the nature of things." He shows that two-thirds of the people of the United States (numbering about 75,000,000) are not directly connected with any form of Christianity, that in Great Britain the situation is little better, and that in Europe a large proportion of the population have turned away from the church, while in Russia, by official action, the nation counts itself outside all Christian churches. Dr. Jones shows that many factors entering into our secular society are indifferent if not antagonistic to the church. He cites the labor movement, the rise of humanism, the growth of nationalism, the emergence of science, secularization of education, appreciation of beauty as an end, the industrial revolution and the prosperity and materialism that accompanies it as interests and conditions which are supplanting the church. Dr. Jones concludes:

> "The warfare of sects and schisms is without doubt one ground among many for the existence of large numbers of unchurched people in all Christian countries. Many of those who would naturally respond to the appeal of authority lose the force of that appeal amidst the confusion of tongues and the loud voices of the divided claimants."

Nothing less than a united church can meet the ethical and moral needs of our world. The ethical standards of Jesus set forth with unified power are needed to save our day from naturalistic cults and behavioristic codes in dealing with moral questions.

The intellectual needs of the world require a church big enough to encompass all truth and not be afraid of it. The scientific method in its search for ultimate reality whether in the spiritual or natural realm is simply a method of fact finding in God's realm of thought and action. The church always has sponsored education and intellectual pursuits, but has not the time come when the denominational college and school and the denominational press must be discontinued as such and merged into Christian institutions and publications? Education and religious literature to be worthy must rise above divisions, distinctions and accusation of propaganda and bias in order to have the approbation of the thinking world. Only unity among the churches can bring this about.

What less than a united church can cope with the social, economic, and political needs of the age in which we live? Before we can socialize industry safely even if we would, we must Christianize society. There can be no reform or human betterment without applied Christianity and a divided church will have no compelling voice or dominating influence to solve such problems. We have the pact of Paris outlawing war but this will be a mere scrap of paper without the support of the Christian conscience of the world made authoritative by a united church. The terrible spectacle of the great world war with Christians fighting Christians under nationalistic sects and all praying God to bless such slaughter could not occur again with Christianity organized against such travesty of religion.

In order to attempt the Christianizing of the social and industrial order there must be a leaven at work and an atmosphere of Christian sentiment created. Individual Christian leaders in industry, society, and politics may try to apply the way of Christ in their fields, but without a new consciousness their efforts will be futile. The church must unite and then with a vision splendid go forth to create new men and a new world of dominant Christian ethics.

It is pertinent to inquire just what denominationalism has done to meet the needs of the world and to what extent can or does it function. The failure of sectarian efforts to evangelize the world has been discussed, but the following facts as to the multiplication of administrative Protestant denominational boards is illuminating. In the world there are 350 foreign missionary boards operating. In China 93 boards are working; in Japan 46; in India 101; in the United States there are 75 foreign boards, 55 home boards, 41 educational boards, and 178 miscellaneous boards — a total of 349. What possible defense can be made for this wasteful duplication and obvious contradiction of all the essential ideals of our common Christianity? What is the situation in our own country as to the products of denominationalism? Most of us who are connected with city churches know the weakness of city Protestantism. Dr. H. Paul Douglass, in the report of "The St. Louis Church Survey," 1920, calls the city church a high hazard and points out that, in that city, between 1899 and 1919 fifty-seven churches passed out of existence, a mortality of 25%. In his findings Dr. Douglass reports that the churches are "suffering under population changes, burdensome overhead, meagre support, excessive turnover of members, and large disappearance losses." He concludes: "The most dependable hope for the future is the growing unity of Protestantism."

Let us take the problem of suburban growth close to some of our big cities. In the borough of Queens, city of New York, the population more than doubled from 1920 to 1927, an increase of 517,000 people, and yet only the most meager and inadequate provision has been made to serve this population which is largely composed of working people and the clerking classes who need help. The status of rural Protestantism is really appalling in many sections, and unless something is done decline and disaster are inevitable. But here again church unity is the only effective solution. The Inter-Church Survey in Ohio in 1919 revealed some startling facts which undoubtedly are typical. The report indicated that obsolete buildings, poor equipment, impoverished support, part time and non-resident ministry and over-churched communities prevailed generally. The summary of facts showed that 55% of rural churches had less than 75 members and that 87% of the ministers of rural churches were non-resident and many gave only part time. In 1,000 towns of less than 1,500 population, 131 towns had a reasonable distribution of churches, and 869 towns were over-churched with competitive and ineffective conditions. A typical county with a population of 30,400 had 5,770 church members (or 24.8%) in 63 churches, averaging 91 members each. What a picture of failure and inefficiency, in this day of prosperity and material development, with new roads, modern schools, attractive places of amusements, the automobile, and the radio available to the rural population. The church will pass out as a community influence unless something is done and that quickly.

It would seem most obvious as to what would happen with a united church or some approximation of a consolidated Protestantism. The results in the United church of Canada constitute a notable exhibit, a demonstration and an assurance of accomplishment. Within one year of the consummation of union, the United church of Canada had consolidated twenty-six boards and committees of the three uniting churches into six boards, three denominational papers into one, and had merged fifteen theological colleges into eight. All the publishing interests are now under one board. 410 churches have been consolidated into half that number since 1925, forming for the most part strong and self-supporting churches. 278 charges where an annual grant of home mission funds had been given, within one year became self-supporting and enabled the United church to open 149 mission fields in new unchurched territory by the use of released funds. The giving is said to have increased 20% and new life and spiritual efficiency is evident everywhere.

The Bureau of Literature and Information of the United church of Canada in its report entitled, "Two Years' Progress in the United church of Canada," says:

> "One must remember that, in Canada, the ideal of union has been working as a leaven for a hundred years, and that here it was possible, as nowhere else, to build a union on the work the church is called to do rather than on theological compromises and philosophical deductions — on a common task and a common spirit rather than on a common tradition.
>
> "The United church of Canada has been in existence for two years and a half — the tremendous spiritual and emotional currents, released at the inauguration services, have found their proper channels, and one may now study with calmness this great adventure of faith, or better, this new discovery of fellowship and power in the unity of the spirit. The United church is not merely an amalgamation, it is a real union of spirit."

The same document has this to say concerning ministerial supply about which there has been some apprehension:

> "When union was consummated there were 270 former Presbyterian ministers without charges. Because of local unions more than two hundred additional ministers required new fields. Yet the need has been sufficiently great to absorb practically all the available effective ministers of the church."

Dr. R. J. Wilson, in a recent article, concludes as follows:

> "A church which enfolds more than two and a half million adherents in Canada, and has fraternal fellowship with nearly a hundred million Christians throughout the world, is so manifestly a fact, in the sphere of the spiritual, that it must not only have a place in, but also a significant meaning for, the rest of the world. It embodies an idea and an ideal. It has within it a practical mysticism, which seeks its verification always in religious experience, a mysticism in which quietism, asceticism, and pietism have no part. It possesses the quiet strength of reality in worship, and the reasoned conviction of an ordered universe where

> God is working his purpose out. It glories in a strong congregational independence, which in Canada spells religious democracy. These things it inherits from the past. But it has more. It has a passion for the unity of all believers, a great hunger for a visible union with manifold diversity, which may be acceptable to him who prayed, 'That they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.' May it not be that this United church, as a potent force working out in the power of the Spirit of Christ the destiny of the race, shall be accepted as a worthy prophecy of the grace of God to a uniting and united Christian world."

What are the next steps and the processes to accomplish unity and push it over from discussion to action? There is danger in attempting either too much or too little. If too comprehensive a merger is undertaken the differences which arose at Lausanne will be encountered and indefinite postponement ensue. Conference and conversation should continue in the larger groups, but, in the meanwhile, "let those unite who will unite." There is also danger of undertaking too little. While it would be desirable if divisions within denominational groups could be brought together, it is quite possible that the small issues which are divisive in the denominational families would be overcome if a more far-reaching and substantial effort was made to bring similar denominations together. There is the possibility of a great waste of time and effort if complete unity is worked out in pairs of denominations in which adjustments of property and board interests are made. Would it not be more effective before final consummation of the lesser combinations has been completed, to attempt the larger feasible mergers? It is well that discussions and joint conferences be held between both interdenominational and intra-denominational groups, but these approaches should be broadened as far as larger accomplishment seems possible.

A needy world awaits with expectancy the coming of a united church of Christ in the United States and throughout the world.

Frank A. Horne.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

The Hope of This Generation Is the Reunion of Non-Episcopalians

SOME of the tracts published by Anglo-catholics are quite excellent, especially those which deal with the sacramental system, and a few of these are doctrinally so correct that they could be given to a Catholic child. Others, as for instance, those dealing with Bible matters, are modernistic; others, again, contain a number of errors which are relics of the Protestantism of the Anglo-catholic party, while yet others fail only because of that studied vagueness which is the outcome of the position of Anglo-catholicism as a subsection of the comprehensive Anglican communion.

We wish here to refer especially to a tract entitled: *English Catholicism and the See of Rome,* by F. Hood. Its moderation and courtesy would recommend it to any reader, and as it gives an Anglican survey of church history as the justification of the Anglican church, it is of real interest to us Catholics, who watch the gradual approximation of a section of Anglicanism toward Catholic truth with the deepest sympathy and hopefulness. What would strike any Catholic reader most in this survey of Christendom is the complete neglect of non-episcopalian Christianity. There are about one hundred and seventy million non-episcopalian Christians in the world. By non-episcopalians we mean all those who do not believe episcopacy to be of divine institution, even if, as American Methodists, Scandinavians, English Evangelicals and some German Lutherans, they continue to use the name of bishops (or, in Latin, superintendents) for their leading ministers. Now it seems to us that these non-episcopalians can advance against Anglo-catholics exactly the same argument as Anglicans advance against Catholics. Mr. Hood, I am sure, will not think me discourteous if I use almost exactly the same phraseology as he does, and put it on the lips of an Evangelical, for the purpose of bringing out my idea.

"Christendom," so he might plead, "is, alas, divided! It is not our fault, we find it so. The origin of the division was mainly political. First, there was the division between east and west in the year 1054, it was mainly a question of church government, viz., the authority of the chief bishop; then there was a further division in the west, again mainly on a question of church government, viz., about the authority of bishops in general. In 1054 a large section broke away because they disbelieved the claims of the chief bishop to be such by divine appointment; in the sixteenth century a large section broke away because they disbelieved the claim of bishops in general to be such by divine appointment. It is probable, therefore, that the ecclesiastical claims of these three sections are not of the essence of the Christian faith. The non-episcopalian ministry is evidently blessed with the grace to bring sinners to Christ. The vast bulk of the non-episcopalians accept the Apostles' creed (a very small section does not actually use it in their liturgy but accepts the substance of it); the Apostles' creed is, after all, *the* historic creed of Christendom. Non-episcopalians have the rite of baptism and the eucharist; the greater number have retained the apostolic ceremony of confirmation. They have the apostolic ministry of presbyters and deacons — the only ministry, after all, which is accepted by *all* Christendom. It is true that Anglo-catholics reject the validity of Presbyterian orders, but Romanists reject the validity of Anglican orders, hence we can bear their rejection with equanimity, especially as the majority in their church cannot agree on this matter. Monseigneur Wace, one of the ablest men of their communion, certainly does not hold episcopacy as of divine institution. The greatest hope for this generation lies in the reunion of non-episcopalians throughout the world. When this is an accomplished fact, we shall be in a far stronger position to treat with the great episcopal bodies of Europe, and we hope and pray that ultimate reunion will be reached on the basis of a constitutional episcopate. All Christians would gladly recognize the bishops as leaders in Christendom, if only some day they could modify their claim to divine authority apart from appointment by the congregation. In such a united Christian church we should hope for a great variety of non-essentials. The august and time-honored ceremonies of the Anglican rite might well be continued to be performed in St. Paul's cathedral for those who preferred them, while those who had learned to love a less stereotyped liturgy would be free to hear it in some of the noble churches of the Wesleyans or Presbyterians."

Now how can Anglicans reject this plea of non-episcopalians and still retain their argument against Catholics? Evangelicals merely substitute episcopacy for papacy. Anglo-catholics are deeply convinced that "an apostolic ministry" is essential to the validity of the sacraments and is of the very essence of the Catholic church. Episcopacy is vital to them. Papacy is vital to Catholics, as vital as the episcopacy is to them. Evangelicals can hardly credit Anglo-catholics with really believing that episcopacy is *essential* to the church of God. Notwithstanding the stoutest professions of Anglo-catholics to the contrary, Evangelicals with an almost annoying patience wait for the time when the unhistorical fiction of an apostolic succession will be given up. Now the attitude of an Anglo-catholic toward a Methodist is logically identical with the attitude of a Catholic toward an Anglican. Catholics hold the papacy to be of divine institution, and, therefore, to be accepted with divine faith, just as all other doctrines revealed by Jesus Christ. Anglicans are convinced of the contrary, but can they not make an effort at least to understand a religion different from their own, and strive to realize that we hold our religion as sincerely as they do theirs?

[From *The Catholic Gazette,* London.]

Union of Scotch Presbyterians

Many years have passed since the general assemblies of the Presbyterian churches in Scotland evoked such widespread interest as they did at their meetings in May. This was mainly due to the fact that the supreme courts of the church of Scotland and the United Free church of Scotland met on that occasion, separately, for the last time. They will meet once more, it is true, on the 1st of October, but only in order to unite and so consummate the "union" for which the two churches have been negotiating for over twenty years.

In the church of Scotland Assembly the interest was focused mainly upon the union debate. It was indeed hardly a debate, for opinion is now practically unanimous in favor of uniting with "our sister church across the way," as we are wont to refer to her (a narrow street separates the two assembly halls). Still, a crowded house listened with rapt attention while Dr. White, the convener of the union committee, in a noble and impassioned speech, moved "That the house resolve upon an incorporating union with the United Free church of Scotland." He was ably seconded by Lord Sands, and, an amendment having found only one supporter, besides the mover and seconder, the motion was declared carried amid great applause. After the moderator's prayer of thanksgiving for the goodness of God in leading the church at last to this great decision, the Assembly rose and joined in singing, "Praise God, from whom all blessings flow." So was concluded one of the most thrilling sittings of the Assembly.

* * * * * * * * * * *

It is now definite that there will be a "split" in the United Free church, and that a proportion of ministers, office-bearers, and members, headed by the Rev. James Barr, B. D., a former secretary of the Assembly's Home Mission Committee, and a member of the British House of Commons, in which he represents the Motherwell division of Lanarkshire, will, as they claim, "continue the United Free church." In the course of the Assembly debate on union it was made abundantly clear on the one hand that the leaders of the "majority" had done everything possible to satisfy the conscience claims of the "non-concurring" brethren, short, that is, of altogether abandoning union on its present basis; and on the other that all their differences had been maintained in a most brotherly way by the "minority," and full recognition given by them to the spirit in which the overtures for complete unanimity had been made by the union leaders.

[From *The Quarterly Register,* Edinburgh, Scotland.]

The South Indian Reunion Scheme

THE following is the report of a committee of Anglo-catholic scholars and divines, appointed to consider the decisions of the Bangalore conference concerning the proposed union of the United South Indian church with the English church in that district.

The report is signed by Bishop Gore; Fr. H. P. Bull, superior of the society of St. John the Evangelist; Prebendary Mackay, vicar of All Saints', Margaret Street; the Rev. G. A. Michell, principal of St. Stephen's House, Oxford; the Rev. G. L. Prestige; the Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D. D.; Mr. Will Spens, master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; the Rev. Dr. Darwell Stone, principal of Pusey House, Oxford; Dr. Cuthbert H. Turner, Dean Ireland professor of exegesis of holy Scripture in the University of Oxford; and Fr. P. N. Waggett, D. D., S. S. J. E.

The report is as follows:—

1. We wish first of all to express our deep sympathy with Indian Christians in that, while Europeans have brought them the gospel, they have brought it by no means as the message of the one catholic fellowship, but obscured and burdened by our long-standing divisions and controversies. It is altogether right that they should resent these divisions in which they find themselves involved and which do not much interest them, and that they should resent them more and more as there awakens among them the desire that the Indian church should stand on its own basis, and not be forced to regard itself as dependent on foreign churches.

We, therefore, welcome whole-heartedly the efforts being made in South India to terminate some at least of our existing divisions by working out a scheme of reunion which all the uniting bodies can accept without what they regard as a scrifice of principle. Further, inasmuch as the influences under which those Indian Christians whom we are now considering have been brought, have been, for the most part, of a distinctively Protestant kind, it is natural that their outlook should be of a like nature, and that they should take no account of the Roman Catholics of India who remain quite outside their purview. Even the Syrian Christians, who are their near neighbors, and are a very large group, are unfortunately (so far as appears) not now included in their negotiations.

2. But it is obvious that the whole Anglican communion must be interested in these negotiations, and must have a duty to examine them. What is proposed is a union of South Indian Christians, which would leave the United church simultaneously in fellowship (which appears to be identified with communion) with the Anglican body throughout the world and with a number of Protestant, non-episcopal bodies. Thus we are directly concerned in their proceedings. The Anglican communion is the home of Catholics as well as Protestants; and has, largely because this is the case, a special vocation to minister to the cause of general reunion. We are bound, therefore, to examine carefully any proposals for reunion in one direction to see if they contain anything which would render them impossible of acceptance to those Anglicans whose outlook is different, or anything which would make futile efforts toward reunion in the other direction. If this is regarded as a drawback to the free development of the Anglican communion — as it is — it is a drawback inherent in its boasted compre-

hensiveness. It is, moreover, obvious that though the proposed scheme of union is limited in its scope to a particular district — South India — it would, if approved, become a decisive precedent to be followed in many parts of the world.

3. There can, we fear, be no question that there are certain features in the report which catholic-minded persons must view with grave anxiety, and a few which they might find so inconsistent with their principles that they could not retain their membership in any church which formally sanctioned them. We will deal first with proposals which we cannot but regard as falling into the latter class.

(*a*) When once the union is formed, it is proposed that all henceforth who are to be ordained to the ministry of the church are to be ordained by bishops. After a time, therefore, all will have been so ordained. But during an interval, reckoned at thirty years, a large number of those who are to be fully recognized as ministers of the word and sacraments will have received no episcopal ordination, and during that period at least it will be possible for them to be admitted to the full pastoral charge of (hitherto) Anglican congregations — temporarily with the consent of the particular congregation and its minister, and permanently with the consent of the congregation and bishop.

It is to be noted that the protest of a single individual communicant could prevent this, but that does not affect the principle. And it will be remembered that the tradition among the Indian Christians of our communion would not, in all cases, have led them to resent such a suggestion. On the other hand, the General Council of the church of England in India carefully excluded this very contingency.

It is, then, in our judgment, essential that the restriction contemplated by the General Council should be recognized unconditionally. What has enabled the Anglican communion to hold together is the rule that "no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful bishop, priest or deacon in the church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined and admitted thereunto according to the form [of the Anglican ordinal], or hath had formerly episcopal consecration or ordination." Its power of holding together in the future depends on the observance of this rule. It is equally true that its prospect of restoring inter-communion with, for instance, the Orthodox and Old Catholic churches depends on the same condition.

(*b*) The point of view expressed throughout the report is that of "the full mutual recognition of the ministries of the United church." Now we gladly recognize that "the fruit of the Spirit" and his activity have been abundantly apparent in non-episcopal communions and their ministries — not least among the Friends, who repudiate all sacramental ordinances — and we welcome the principle that "God is not tied to his sacraments," but can give his gifts as and when he will; we recognize also how often separations from the church have been due, in great measure, to the church's own fault. And we do not feel any desire to ask of anyone, minister or layman of a non-episcopal communion, any expression of doubt as to the reality of the spiritual gifts which he believes himself to have received. But we must ask that they should at least recognize that it has been the constant belief of Catholics that the threefold ministry is the only valid ministry of the church, which has descended in orderly and legitimate succession from the apostles, and that its recovery, where it has been lost, is the necessary condition of union. Thus we cannot be satisfied with the expression, "the full mutual recognition" of the different ministries "as ministers of the word and of the sacraments" as if it were agreed that there is no essential difference between one ministry and another. Nor can we be satisfied with the statement, "the historic episcopate in a constitutional form is the method of church government, which is more likely than any other to promote and preserve the organic unity of the church." This seems to us wholly inadequate, as making episcopacy a matter of utility and not of principle. These expressions, though they may well express the mind of those with whom we are coming into union, should be omitted from any document which is to express the joint mind of both parties. We believe, therefore, that it is necessary, if due respect is to be paid to the faith of the Anglican church, to omit the word "mutual" in section I of the resolution concerning the ministry of the United church, and to provide the security demanded by the General Council referred to above, that the ministers of the hitherto Anglican congregations shall always be persons who have received episcopal ordination, while agreeing that existing ministers not so ordained shall be recognized within the united church as ministering to the hitherto non-episcopal congregations, until the time comes when all shall have received the same ordination.

(*c*) We consider the words, "intention and expectation," do not adequately express an agreement that eventually all the ministers of the word and sacraments in the United church are to be episcopally ordained. This agreement should be unequivocably expressed as the basis of union, and not as an "intention and expectation" only. Further, the clause "After this period of thirty years, the church will consider and decide the question of such exceptions to the general principle of an episcopally-ordained ministry" seems to us inconsistent with such an agreement as to the future, and should be omitted.

4. We note that a number of points of great importance are deferred to a future meeting of the joint committee — especially the vital question of the position of confirmation in the united church, the continuance of the diaconate, marriage questions, and the form of the liturgy; we, therefore, say nothing on these questions save that we earnestly pray that nothing may be suggested under these heads for common acceptance which is incompatible with the teaching of Scripture and the constant tradition of the church catholic.

We notice (on p. 2, par. 5) that an open communion service (so at least, we suppose, that we must interpret the language used) was held for the members of the committee. That is contrary to the rule of our church. Intercommunion at the Lord's table is the goal at which we are aiming, and will be evidence of its accomplishment, but is not to be treated as a means by which it can be accomplished.

We have been asked to supply an answer to the question, what is the *minimum requirement,* which, in this particular case, catholic-minded persons ought, as we think, to make as a condition of assenting to the union. We have done what we can to answer this question by specifying what suggestions or expressions of the report appear to us impossible of acceptance. But we desire to state further that, if the obstacles we have named were removed by further negotiations and the proposals consequently amended, the church of India, in our judgment, could rightly enter into such temporary relations of communion and coöperation with the United church as are contemplated in the present proposals, with a view to the attainment of full and complete intercommunion at the close of the intermediate period.

Whatever relations the United church may enter into with other organized bodies of Christians should, we believe, be regarded by the church of India as temporary, and as entered upon with a view to the extension of union, and not as involving a position of full inter-communion, and this, we think, should be clearly stated. In saying all this, we are, of course, leaving out of account considerations which might arise out of the treatment of the questions as yet left undetermined.

But some of us are bold enough to wish to add a further suggestion. In their judgment, a different complexion would be put on the proposals if it was possible to bring into the union the neighboring Syrian Christians; to accept the principle that it was desired, in view of the opportunity thus afforded, that the United church should have, from the first, orders disputed by no Christian church; and for Anglicans and non-Anglicans alike to accept at the time of the union conditional ordination at the hands of Syrian bishops or of bishops conditionally consecrated by these. This was not the opinion of the whole committee.

We must add that, so great is our desire for the reunion of Christians in one body, it is very distateful to us to suggest objections to any scheme which has reunion for its object. But it is obvious that we cannot refrain from regarding every local scheme in the light of its bearing on the whole field or from asking the question whether a particular method of healing one existing schism may not result in producing another.

[From *The Review of the Churches,* London.]

A Move for Union in Northern India

EIGHT churches and missions were represented at a round table conference on church union held at Lucknow, India, with a view to exploring the possibilities of a wider organic union than has hitherto been achieved in northern India. Minutes of the five sessions, which were held on April 10th and 11th, have come to hand and reveal a gratifying kind of progress. Provision was made for a resumption of the conferences and for a considerable amount of spade work. In view of these facts the Christian world will do well to get an exact knowledge of what happened at Lucknow.

The coming together of men representing the widest variety of Christian belief and practice would have been sufficient to make the gathering noteworthy. There were represented the Australian churches of Christ Mission, the Australian Methodist church, the Baptist church, the church of the Brethren Mission, the India Mission Disciples of Christ, the Methodist Episcopal church, the United church of Northern India, the

Wesleyan Methodist Missionary society. Rev. Canon B. H. Fisher of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, a high church group, was present as an unofficial visitor on behalf of the metropolitan of the Anglican church of India.

In view of the revealing character of the findings, it is unnecessary to labor the point that the group represented widely divergent traditions on matters once highly divisive. Matters of polity, of doctrine and of international relationship were found to contain elements requiring analysis before a basis of union could be formulated, but "the representatives were all very definitely and heartily of one mind in urging that the conversations begun in this conference should be continued on the lines indicated in the resolutions adopted."

It was resolved to appoint a continuation committee consisting of five members to present the findings to the churches represented and to other churches and to receive their reports; to arrange for another conference later, if approved by two or more churches, and to prepare the agenda; to prepare a bibliography of the constitutions, organizations, and confessions of the various churches and other relevant publications on church union; to make the work and objects of this conference known in every suitable way; to prepare a budget and to solicit contributions to meet necessary expenses. It was further resolved to recommend that informal inter-church conferences be held in provincial and other convenient local centers for informing the churches of the work of the conference and inviting discussion thereon.

If any essential step toward the goal of organic union has been omitted by this group, it would be interesting to know what that step is. It looks as if a period of intensive study is at hand. All these practical measures for bringing unity nearer are underlain by two considerations which the minutes emphasize: "1. Our thanks to Almighty God that a gathering such as this, characterized by complete brotherliness and good-will, has been made possible, and our conviction that steps toward union could be crowned with success only through the earnest prayers of all and by the guidance of the holy Spirit. 2. The necessity of educating public opinion and promoting fraternal intercourse between the churches whenever possible."

When the delegates met, a representative of each church gave a statement of its constitution and doctrines and of its general attitude toward union. This at once raised the major issues and it was possible to draw up an agenda which should focus discussion on essentials. There was general discussion on each point and then resolutions were presented. All these resolutions were adopted unanimously.

In the general discussion on the first question, that of church polity, it was revealed that a pure congregationalism, recognizing the absolute autonomy of each separate congregation, was not acceptable in India and was rarely found in operation. "In a united church all the elements of real value in congregationalism might be preserved, as had been done to some extent in the United church of Northern India. Government by presbyteries or by some central authority, as in the case of the Methodist Episcopal and the Wesleyan Methodist churches, had been proved effective, and in practice had been adopted, even by churches founded on a congregational basis. It was suggested that provision should be made to avoid the insecurity of tenure revealed in the United church of Northern India and in churches with a congregational basis, so that ministers might be assured of another appointment on the termination of their pastorate in a particular sphere. Certain members indicated their desire for some form of episcopal supervision."

The resolution on these matters was of a tentative character and follows: "The conference feels it would be premature to attempt to project with exactitude the polity desirable in a united church, but the trend of its opinion is to the effect that the statement of polity when determined should embody provisions whereby: "(1) Congregational liberty is secured in so far as it is consistent with the larger good of the church, (2) a central authority is secured on the basis of the presbyterian system, which would probably be accepted by most of the churches represented, and (3) it may be possible, if found desirable, to institute a policy of supervision by superintendents or bishops under constitutional control."

On the sacraments a full and frank discussion took place, in which each group clearly stated its own position, and in this connection, more, perhaps, than in any other, it was seen that no union could be contemplated which did not give full recognition to the convictions of each church. Each had its gift to bring to a united church whereby the whole might be enriched. "We must recognize the place of the child in the church, and we must recognize the necessity of a definite profession of faith on the part of every member," the minutes state in summarizing the discussion. It was found that in some churches only ordained ministers were permitted to administer the sacrament of the Lord's supper, in others laymen were permitted to administer or to assist in the administration. In these circumstances the first resolution on the subject reads simply: "We are agreed that the supreme emphasis must be on spiritual religion." In the matter of baptism the problem arises from the insistence of certain groups upon immersion following a definite profession of faith and from the unwillingness of other groups to depart from their present customs of infant baptism and sprinkling. "We think it desirable," the resolution proceeds, "to explore fully the possibilities of including both groups in one church without sacrifice of vital principles."

As regards the Lord's supper," the finding continues, "no sacerdotal theory being held, there seems to be no obstacle in the way of union in either the doctrine or the practice of the churches officially represented. We are all agreed upon the necessity of order in the observance of this sacrament as of the other. The only considerable problem raised concerns the administration of the Lord's supper by laymen, but it is thought that with due care the interests of good order can without difficulty be safeguarded."

While the allusion to the "churches officially represented" definitely leaves out the Anglican body, the delegates seem ready to look in another direction, resolving further that "while ourselves convinced of the value of the outward observance of the sacraments, we should like to explore the possibilities of including also, in any union that may be projected now, such groups as the Friends, who, stressing the spirituality of religion, do not have any outward ritual for the observance of either baptism or the Lord's supper, as well as such other groups as may feel ready to enter the union."

Some of the churches officially represented had organic relationship with churches in other parts of the world. The great value of this relationship was recognized, as also the fact that a united church must be autonomous. While the union achieved in Canada did not require any facing of this question, any larger undertaking in this country might well have to do so, and so it is interesting to note the resolution: "This conference, having heard the statements made by the representatives of several churches, recognizes the great value of the existing organic relationship in the churches, securing, as it has done, a broader outlook than might have been achieved by a purely national church. At the same time it is realized that a united church must have complete autonomy in the administration of its own affairs. It would express the hope that any negotiations for union that may be conducted, while providing for the latter, will realize the desirability and explore the possibilities of retaining that relationship."

Many expressed the opinion that the confession of faith adopted by the United church of Northern India for substance of doctrine could not be subscribed to. Some thought it would be better to accept the Apostles' creed and the Nicene creed as witnessing to the faith we held. The confession adopted by the United church in China was thought worthy of careful consideration. Some were opposed to the formulation of any creed at all; a greater number were averse to any hard-and-fast creed or confession being imposed as a test upon ministers, officers or members of the church; and all were agreed that any statement of the church's faith, such as might be desirable as a basis of unity, should be as simple as possible. Hence, it was resolved unanimously and tersely as follows: "We are in general agreement that a statement of the common faith of the United church is desirable as an explicit basis of its Christian unity, but that the statement should be of the simplest and briefest character."

These proceedings and findings will gain much in precision of meaning to us by interpretation which may come from persons who attended. Extended comment on the situation is unnecessary. It is interesting and, perhaps, profitable to note that an Indian, Rev. Prof. Yohan Masih, D. D., of the United church of Northern India and a member of the Central India Mission of the United church of Canada, was elected presiding officer of the conference. The somewhat slight emphasis placed on creeds by comparison with the keenness manifested in the matter of sacraments is a feature of some interest. But the main thing is that northern India, like southern India, having had a measure of organic union, is moving on in the consideration of larger and ever larger unity.

[From R. P. Stouffer in *The New Outlook,* Toronto, Canada.]

Our Evasions and Inhibitions

THE Lambeth Conference in 1920 regarded the reunion of Christendom as an "imperative necessity," but in spite of all that was said at the conference or has been said since the different communions have gone along in the same old way perishing from lack of vision and paralyzed in their isolated vocations. The getting together of Christian communions is the greatest question before organized religion to-day. The question of Fundamentalism and Modernism is secondary and will take care of itself, but the greatest demand resting upon Christian institutions now is to get together, at whatever sacrifice to their specific accretions, in the spirit of Christ and his gospel. There is no force in the customary excuses, evasions, and specific religious inhibitions which have become so painfully habitual. There is nothing short of constructive hypocrisy in the repeated exhortations to resort to "prayer" to further "study," to a dependance upon "spiritual guidance," or "waiting for God," or "the time" which has not yet "arrived," and all the other innocuous patent medicines, placeboes, and spiritual pills administered to the credulous and conforming spirits who receive them.

It is nonsense to speak of including Roman Catholics, as we very well know, nor can we delay efforts to unite with other Protestant bodies on the theory that Catholics should be included. To argue that we should include the Catholics is to ignore the Protestants with whom we should immediately make definite progress. Roman Catholicism is much more likely to recognize a united Protestantism than when it is divided.

As the question before the nations is how far they are willing to sacrifice individual sovereignty for a world solution of this problem of international peace — so the question before the churches is how far they are willing to sacrifice their individual characteristics for a solution of "unhappy divisions." The time calls for this challenge to be met. There is an insistent demand to drop all hypocrisy concerning it and to make a great religious renunciation of non-essential and traditional values which are now emphasized out of all proportion to their worth.

In other words, the demand is to quit the graveyards, to cease this cerebration in the cemetery and to indulge in a great exodus from all who are either too old or too unwilling to go forward or from all who wish to "remain among the graves and lodge in the monuments"; to go out from the precincts of dead issues into a living world full of prospect and promise.

There are four reasons which demand that Protestant Christian institutions should come together.

1. The first is religious education for the young, about which so much is being said in the daily press. I do not know whether it is possible to have any religious teaching in the public schools. I do not know whether it would be wise to limit the hours of public school instruction and send children to their respective churches to be taught. I am not in favor of this for many reasons, but I do object to the prohibition of any ethical instruction at all for children in the public schools being im-

posed upon the schools of this country through the influence of non-churchmen, Jews and Roman Catholics, who should be as zealous for ethical character as any one else. The only way in which these unreasoning competitive oppositions can be met is by the union of Christian Protestantism.

2. Protestant leadership is the most effective force yet developed either in religion or politics against the mistaken principle of "divine right" which is not by any means dead, either in state or church.

3. Foreign and domestic missionary effort results in a costly confusion because we can be neither honest nor united in teaching our different brands of religion to unsuspecting foreigners who are now beginning to explain us and criticize our lack of common sense, and our absence of religious fairness; who see through our ecclesiastical competition and who observe that we do not follow the religion which we wish to teach them. The anti-Christian organizations of China constitute a formidable argument on this point.

4. The economic waste in church extension, in over-churched communities, in the expense of printed propaganda and the persistent upkeep of outworn establishments. These are a few of the things which are for the most part among the graves and in the monuments.

A while ago I was in China and made a visit to Kuling on the Yangtse, six thousand feet above the river, where the missionaries gather for the summer holiday. We have a splendid inter-denominational school there which deserves much better support than it receives; all the missionaries are enthusiastic over it and send their children to it in gratitude for such a place. There is also a community chapel constructed sufficiently large to accommodate all the Christians. While there I was invited to preach in the church and supposed that the community church was meant, but to my amazement and bitter disappointment I found the Episcopalians had seen fit to erect their own special building which stands there as an eloquent monument to that sort of denominational superiority, which in such a place amounts to a scandal, and makes a pitiful contradiction to the spirit of the schoolhouse which stands just beyond it. This is a fine specimen of what virulent denominationalism leads to, in a summer resort for resting missionaries of all communions.

It is well enough to make courteous and neighborly gestures by inviting other ministers to share in our services, to preach in our pulpits, to sit on platforms at civic meetings, or dine side by side at occasional banquets; this is all trivial, really insignificant, and when everything is said and done a sort of playing to the galleries. If these customs mean anything let us ask ourselves how far we are willing to go with them. I would like to ask what good reason can be given for not immediately calling together the representatives of the various communions right here in this city of New York for the purpose of a free, open, honest discussion of a method for an immediate practical physical union among the churches without any more fuss, but in the spirit of an inter-denominational challenge, to say things plainly and mean them honestly, and to do things immediately.

Four things I can suggest as leading to a unity of this kind:

First.—The admission that any baptism by minister or layman, Catholic or Protestant or anybody else, without any creedal test is a sufficient fulfilment of the gospel expectation; for baptism is after all a sign of a Christian's profession, an oath of office, a symbolic dedication of life to the highest things we know; and indicates not a complete achievement but a convinced attitude, an oath of Christian endeavor.

Second.—An absolutely free Communion table, wherever there is one, without any permission or examination or hesitation, but a Communion which will displace our present ex-Communion; that will declare this beautiful act of our belief in a human brotherhood, in our spiritual solidarity and will admit that the table does not belong to any church of any name whatever, but to the one God whose children we all are, no matter what we call ourselves. When you consider how on an occasion during the war a few soldiers with a log for a Communion table, opened a bottle of wine and broke a loaf of bread in the name of him who was broken for our offenses, is any one willing to assert that there was ever a more valid Communion administered since the institution by Jesus himself than on that occasion? Have we not lost something by relegating the Communion to the altar of the church instead of sharing it with the altar of the home? Why should not a father gather his family around him and break bread and drink wine in his own home in imitation of the Master? The Communion was not instituted on an altar but in an upper room, and my suggestion may reveal how far we have gone from the real spirit of the Master and how we have actually lost the Saviour in the family and in the home. There is nothing radical in such a suggestion. It is reasonable, natural, spiritual and homely in the highest sense of that splendid word.

Third.—To value this inter-change of pulpits as nothing but a superficial courtesy; for anybody can preach with or without ordination — laymen as well as ministers as they always have done in every church. It is disgraceful that even this custom has been hedged about with rules and limitations. But I mean to go further than that; I mean to suggest that we should immediately agree that any ordained Christian minister can take part in, share, or perform any ministerial act of whatsoever nature in any of our churches, whenever courtesy or convenience invites him; and that there will be no question or reservation about his validity or rights or powers. It will be enough for us as it was for Christ that he follows the same Master and is set apart to his service in the church of God, which is bigger and better than any one branch of it. To contradict this may be canonical or ecclesiastical, but it is not gospel and it is not Christ. This challenge will not down. We meet it or we dodge it and that is all. I would like to see the time when an Episcopal church could call a Presbyterian, Baptist or Methodist minister as naturally as an Episcopalian, and when these could thus call our clergy — if they could stand it.

Fourth.—That we should become spiritual in our economic commonsense as well as in our worship and stop the extension of new churches in places where there are already churches enough; that in small communities where one church is enough and there are four or five too many, the others should sell out and give the proceeds to the church that has the srtength, no matter what name it bears or what communion it considers itself to belong to. This may sound destructive, and so it is — for it would require a sharp break with our sanctified selfishness — but it is right, it is Christian and that should be enough for us.

If these four suggestions find any sympathy it will mean the end of this self-saving spirit among the communions; it will stop all talk among us of historic episcopate except as an interesting and valuable evolution, because the other communions will be able to go back of all our historicity and show that the early church was first congregational, then presbyterian and then episcopalian. Our boasted evolution is not as old as their origin. We have no more right to ask other communions to receive the episcopate except as an economic convenience than the Roman Catholics have a right to insist that we shall accept the pope; both are ecclesiastical imitations of political patterns.

[From Rev. Karl Reiland in *The Churchman,* New York.]

LETTERS AND COMMENT

Constitution and By-Laws

To the Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly:*—

Dear Sir.—A great deal of our failure is due to following out incorrect lines of progress. You cannot make a quince tart out of oranges, no matter how many oranges you employ. A good deal of our effort at church union tends only to get us farther away from it, because it is directed toward something much farther away — church unity.

The Lausanne conference ran along beautifully, until they ran into something upon which they all could not agree: and then there seemed to be nothing further that could be done. But that was the very point where progress should have started.

Church unity means that all Christians must think practically alike, which will very probably never be the case. But church union means that, with the different churches expressing divergent views on many subjects, they all may still unite in fellowship and service. In the world war, we had a unity of command, on the part of the allies, along with distinctively national organizations. In the United States, the different states preserve their individuality and rights, where this seems to be the more efficient way, and, at the same time, those functions which can best be performed through unified command are committed to the general or central government. To attain church union, let the churches make a list of those things on which they are agreed, and unite thereon; and another list of those things on which they differ, and make these the bases of their denominational organizations. The first might be designated as, or likened to, the constitution; the matters of difference might be denominated, or likened to, the by-laws of the different branches.

The working out of these details might involve many difficulties; but by keeping this rule resolutely in mind, none would be insuperable. If Baptists insist upon immersion and object to infant baptism, let them retain that in their own by-laws. If Episcopalians insist upon apostolic succession, cannot the rest of us grant them the privilege so to believe for themselves? If the Roman Catholics claim that the pope is the head of their own church, why not concede them their claim; and why cannot they relinquish that vain claim, so far as other churches are concerned? And, if they insist on domineering, with a claim that we are no churches and that the pope's authority by right extends over us, then it is not our fault that they remain outside the re-united church of Christ, but their own; and we should feel conscience-free in letting them go their own way until they can "shinny on their own side." If I have misrepresented any in the above, let it be understood that the remarks were made by way of illustration, under an "if" in every case, and without any animadversion. I have purposely expressed the difficulties as baldly as possible.

The principal stumbling blocks are: recognition of the ministry (I will not use the word "orders"), transfer of members, and the Lord's supper. I was once invited to speak in a Protestant Episcopal church, and did so. But I knew "the rules of the game": I spoke from the left-hand desk, instead of from the right-hand (or was it the other way?), and I did not "take a text," which I often omit, in my own church. I had no right to speak from the other desk: and no other minister even of the Protestant Episcopal church had any right whatever to speak from any desk in that church building, without a proper invitation. I did not speak against apostolic succession: the chief reason being, that this would not have been polite nor Christian. But neither the pastor, nor the congregation, nor I, felt the least embarrassment at my presence there. If I had received a call to become pastor of that congregation, I do not see why I should have objected to any service of induction (or "ordination"), provided it contained nothing derogatory to my former status as a minister of another church: and why should it, or what right had it to criticize another's servant? Cannot an agreement concerning the ministry be reached, on that basis?

Transfers of members ought to be practical, on the same basis: confession of faith; and promise to abide by the rules of the denomination. Some churches baptize infants (of Christian parents), and require a "renewal of the baptismal vows" on coming into full church membership; others give the baptism only to adults, usually at admission to full membership, I believe, but have a "dedication" of the infants: it ought not to be very difficult to bring these two systems into approximate harmony. I knew a woman, a baptized Christian, who lied, at the River Jordan, so as to be baptized (re-baptized) there: I can appreciate her desire for some ceremony in that river of hallowed memories, and trust that the good God was willing to condone the untruth in view of the pious motive;—but what harm would there be in allowing anybody, even though already baptized, to celebrate a memorial baptism there, or anywhere else? If a required re-baptism does not renounce nor slight a former baptism, what harm will it do? And why need it?

I fear the reason why some Christians cannot conscientiously unite with others at the Lord's table is, first, that they do not realize that our common Lord is personally present at the board; and, second, because they do not use his words, at the service. It has seemed to me, that the most of us have combed heaven and earth, to find some other words than his, with which to "do these things in his memory." We ought to be able to unite, by using his words (John 13 to 15; and the synoptics). But, if this should appear to be an insuperable obstacle, then it is not ours to try to convert one another, as we have been trying, but to find our common ground and our points of difference, and segregate them. If need be, for holding a union service, let an authorized minister of each sect first in turn, consecrate the elements in the way provided, and then all commune together; or, even, let there be separate communions, with different elements, but all in one congregation, and in one spirit of Christian union and fellowship.

Questions of finance, of government, of missions, and all other questions can, I believe, be settled on this same basis: rendering to the denomination the things that belong to the denomination, and to the union the things that belong thereto; and mingling with all, Christian love.

Carlisle, Pa. RUTER W. SPRINGER.

Another View of the South India Union

To the Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly.*

Dear Sir:—I have been carrying on a fair amount of correspondence with Dr. Banninga regarding church union in South India. Like many whose voices are not as yet heard, I find the present scheme of union in South India quite unacceptable. As you will have gathered, I come from a Congregational church and from such have inherited what may be called spiritual ideals of church union. As you may know, it is the fundamental principle of the London Missionary Society, "that its design is not to send presbyterianism, independency, episcopacy or any other form of church order or government . . . but the glorious gospel of the blessed God . . . and that it shall be left . . . to the minds of the persons whom God shall call into the fellowship of his Son from among them to assume for themselves such form of church government as to them shall appear most agreeable to the word of God."

I think you will agree that there can hardly be a more broad minded and open minded fundamental principle than that. It leaves us every opportunity for church unity and makes capital of the indigenous character of the church. It follows that the missionaries, while they may lead, guide, and instruct the people, may not form for them their rules of church government. Now in the scheme at present put forward, we see very little of what the Indian himself would have arranged as church government, but much and almost exclusively that which is obviously the copy and in some ways the spoilt copy of several Western churches. The result is that the new church in South India (if it ever comes on the present basis) will be bound by rites, creeds, and government which are foreign to its mentality and its spiritual genius. This is what Indians are saying in some quarters: "Divisions among Christians are not ours nor is the contemplated union ours. If we want divisions in our churches, let them be ours, products of our own religious genius and, likewise, let the union be real spiritual creation of the Indian mind. The scheme is based on what is called the Lambeth quadrilateral, formed by the diplomatic genius of the English bishops. It has absolutely nothing to do with the Indian conception of religion and race heritage." Quoted from the *South India United Church Herald* of August, 1929, as being the proceedings of the Bangalore Christian conference expressing Indian opinion by Indians.

In view of these distressing matters, I have been led to study more deeply than I otherwise would have done, the whole scheme, and in view of its efforts which mean little less than absorption, to think out some other way to union that will be real and spiritual.

I think, perhaps, my first conclusion was that the unity of organization wherever contemplated or accomplished will not lead to unity in the real sense. In the spirit of the union meetings there is an atmosphere which is not shared by the ordinary laymen, and which soon leads to the lessening of real differences and the acceptance of those things which in the practical and normal spirit of the church would not be conceded. So much depends upon the arrangement of speakers and the way in which the case is presented. It is my experience that many are clever at the minimizing of differences, which, as soon as the people get time to think over in ordinary life, are not to be so covered or lost. Church history has enough instances of this to make any person careful of its repetition. Take for instance, the first general council; the Nicæan, in 325 A.D. In the "heat" of the council chamber, the middle party, led by Eusebius of Nicomedia, although they were the majority, yielded to the spirit of it, led as the council was by the young deacon of great acumen and learning, Athanasius. When this middle party had time to think over what they had accepted, they repented of it and broke away. Later they joined the Arians in bringing the reversal of the Nicene decrees. I am sure that if the present scheme of union is "put on" the church in South India, something similar will take place (in South India). I am quite sure that in the "heat" of the council chambers, many delegates on the scheme of union in South India, have been "swept off their feet" by the eloquence of such men as the bishop of Bombay, who knew how to state their own case in an acceptable way.

I have not kept my own council in these matters. I have tried to get light on them but without satisfaction. This has set me all the more against the present scheme and led me to seek more earnestly some other way to real union.

At the very beginning of all schemes of union I think you will find the words of Jesus: "Father . . . I pray that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they may also be in us; that the world may believe that thou didst send me." (John 17:21) Now what did Jesus mean? Did he mean organic or spiritual union? Our schemes of union will depend on our answer! I believe that Jesus was referring to a unity generated within the inner life and sustained by continual contact with him. It certainly did not refer to a unity imposed from without! It referred to the direct influence of the Father on his children. It means acting the parable of the vine and the branches in everyday life! It is natural to expect the church which emphasizes the priesthood to put the weight on the instrumentality of the human factor and accordingly to build up, contrary to the Spirit of Jesus, a huge and elaborate organization, full of rules and regulations, which, far from bringing about unity, will be its greatest hindrance and cause many to stumble. But true unity transcends all this and is a matter of our life that is "hid with Christ in God." It has reference in a temporal degree to conditions here and now in so far as our present life is indissolubly linked with the future. In taking account of the temporal aspect of unity, i.e., as it has to deal with the present, we must in no wise allow it to hide the real spiritual nature of the unity referred to by Jesus. This means that any organization, aiming at fostering unity in the spirit, must not in the least degree interfere with the freedom that is ours as sons of God. Here I find some words of Dr. Forsyth very helpful: "Let us find the unity of the church not in itself but in its message, in the unity of the gospel that made the church. To be sure of the one gospel is to be secure of the one church. . . . The sects arose as gifts of God to the church. They rose for a churchly need and purpose. They were appointed to recall the church to this or that neglected point in the gospel. . . . To be Christian . . . is to enter Christ; and to enter Christ is in the same act to enter the church which is in Christ. Faith in Christ is faith in One whose indwelling makes a church." (*The Church and the Sacraments*, p. 36 and 40.)

To me, such a church and such unity of the spirit alone can fulfil those prayers of Jesus. So strongly do I feel this that I cannot associate myself with unity which begins by aiming at one organization, and tries thereby to effect unity of the spirit. I believe that church unity is already an accomplished fact, as Dr. Forsyth has pointed out. What is needed is the deepening of spiritual life in all our churches and denominations and a genuine desire to throw open our doors not only for ordinary services but for all occasions when we seek the spirit of Christ. To bring this about I feel a sort of central council of worldwide Christianity might be formed. This would bring about the real unity not by enforcing rules, ritual or creeds, but by being a body whose sole purpose would be so to labor as to help the churches of the world to realize their own true significance and worth to themselves and to the world of Christianity, by leading them, in the best sense, to Christ. It would be a unifying body, a prayer union, a clearing house, an advisory body, it would survey the "foreign fields" and see that there was no overlapping and could be all that the representatives of all the churches cared with God's help to make it. There could be branches attached to each city or large area which could work locally but always in close relation to the central body. All Christians who made a simple statement of faith could be enrolled through one of the branches or the central body. By a simple statement of faith I mean one upon which all Christians are united, e.g., "We have faith in God the Father, in Jesus Christ whom he sent and in the continual operation of his Spirit. We acknowledge the importance of the holy scriptures and recognize the unity of all Christians in Jesus Christ." I believe that such a Council would meet the need of the world for union.

ARTHUR A. TAYLOR.

London Mission,
Bellary, S. India.

Can They Get Together in the Philippines?

To the Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly.*

Dear Sir:—Some time ago I attended a meeting where the question of church union was vigorously discussed. It has a way of getting before the house these days since the Presbyterians, United Brethren, and Congregationalists united. It centered around the obstacles to union and the wisdom of complete Filipinization of the church. I set down here in slightly expanded form the notes I took.

The obstacles to union are: (1) The feeling on the part of denominational groups that each has a monopoly on God's truth and grace; (2) a lack of appreciation of the contributions to religious life made by the denominations and a consequent bitterness toward denominationalism; (3) the absence of emphasis upon our common ties.

A Filipino layman classified the obstacles thus: Those which proceed from Filipinos, A lack of proper education; lack of courage. Men who might lead in union movements are afraid of ecclesiastical authorities. (Practically all of whom are foreigners.) Those which proceed from Americans: The lack of sacrificial spirit. They do not want to give up their jobs and their authority. They like being spiritual bosses. Those common to Filipinos and Americans: Emphasis upon non-essentials; they do not appreciate the common ground occupied by all churches; the absence of ability to see the problems of disunion and to work out solutions.

On the question of complete Filipinization of the church the missionaries remained silent but the Filipino laymen and pastors expressed their convictions freely. Here are some of the pros and cons. (1) The Filipinos are entirely capable of running their own church. Leadership is plentiful. However, there are not enough students in the Union Theological Seminary at present to furnish adequate leadership for the future. (2) The question is, How soon will we be able to manage our own church affairs? The time has not yet come. We must train in self-support. (3) When the missions first came to the Islands and won their first converts, the management of the church should have been entrusted to Filipinos. At the present stage in the development they would have been in full charge. (4) The time has come to put Filipinos in all places of responsibility but missionaries must be retained in advisory capacities. In order to serve well in such positions, the missionary must lose himself in the work. (5) At any rate the time has arrived for more concessions to Filipinos by missionaries.

The foreign field has some advantages over the home base when it comes to threshing out church union and other problems of coöperation. But it has to watch its step lest it tread on racial or national prejudices, or get its feet all mixed up in a tangle of whose job shall become somebody else's, or step on the doctrinal or denominational corns of some of the folk who furnish the money.

E. K. Higdon.

Manila, P. I.

BOOK REVIEWS

IN MEMORIAN: CHARLES HENRY BRENT. World Conference on Faith and Order, Box 226, Boston, Mass.

Some one who was close to Bishop Brent will doubtless write the story of his life. The article in the July number of *The Christian Union Quarterly* by Bishop Edward L. Parsons was the best appreciation of him that we have seen. The memorial service at the cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York, is contained in this brochure which has been sent out by the continuation committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order. It contains the addresses on that occasion by Bishop W. T. Manning, Dr. William Adams Brown, Dr. Robert E. Speer, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, and Dr. Frederick Lynch; also the address of Dr. Adolf Keller delivered at Lausanne, along with expressions from others. Bishop Brent and Mr. Robert H. Gardiner wisely led the affairs of the World Conference. It is difficult to see how we can go ahead without them, but new leaders will come to the front. The World Conference is a great movement and it must continue. Bishop Brent reflected Christ wonderfully in his contacts with people. He has left a great impression around the world for understanding and appreciation.

TRAINING FOR WORLD FRIENDSHIP. A Manual in Missionary Education for Leaders of Young People. By Ina Corinne Brown, author of *Jesus' Teaching on the Use of Money*, etc. Nashville: Cokesbury Press; 203 pages; price, $1.00.

This book is divided into two parts. The first deals with ideas and motives; the second deals with aims and methods. The church should be foremost in training for friendship among the nations. This book serves as a help to that end. It is particularly well adapted to young people's activities. If we are to have higher and better attitudes the beginning is with the young. It is brim full of fine things and its price puts it in the reach of all.

THE LETTERS OF PETER PLYMLEY TO HIS BROTHER ABRAHAM WHO LIVES IN THE COUNTRY, Together with Selected Writings, Sermons, and Speeches by Sidney Smith, canon residentiary of St. Paul's, London. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.; 296 pages; pricec, $2.50.

John Henry Newman and Sidney Smith were contemporaries. Both had a passion for truth. The subject matter of both was Catholicism. Newman wrote his *Apologia* and *Gerontius* and Smith wrote Letters to his Brother Abraham. The various subjects that passed before him for discussion and the clever approach to his themes without disclosing the authorship, make this book a kind of biography, as interesting, too, as though it were written in these times. It is a delightful book to read by the fireside on a long evening.

The Master's Memorial. A Manual for the Enrichment of the Communion Service Prepared by Rev. Samuel Blair. Nashville: Cokesbury Press; 200 pages; price, $2.00.

One of the most hopeful signs of the times is the growing emphasis that is being given to the Communion service. Mr. Blair has done a fine piece of work in giving to the churches this suggestive volume. It contains twelve eucharistic meditations by as many well known ministers of various denominations, accompanied by prayers and suggestions from ministers and laymen. The communion meditations are particularly helpful, likewise the suggestions for its observance on such days as New Year's day, home-coming day, Thanksgiving day, and Christmas day, but hardly on memorial day. War and the Lord's supper will never mix and it is a strange suggestion in these days to even think of such a thing. But the book is full of good things. It will be found profitable to any one who is seeking help to a deeper reality in its observance.

Religion in Soviet Russia. Anarchy. By William Chauncey Emhardt, field director Foreign-born American Division and secretary of Ecclesiastical Relations of the National Council of the Episcopal Church. Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co.; 386 pages; price, $4.00.

The first centuries and the seventh century mingle together in the religious conditions in Russia from the revolution of 1917 to the present time. This book is a presentation of conditions largely from official documents. It is an astonishing revelation of the struggle between the Soviet government and the Orthodox church. It is pertinent to inquire whether the present civilization will attempt to do in other parts of the world, if it gets a chance, what it is attempting to do in Russia, if Christianity does not adapt itself to a practical expression of brotherhood? The book is worthy of careful reading. Its records awaken sympathy for our brethren in Russia.

A New Book from the Press of
Willett, Clark & Colby, Chicago

"The Scandal of Christianity"

By

PETER AINSLIE

Contents

I. The Blight of Denominationalism.

II. Denominationalism at a Discount in the Eyes of an Intelligent World.

III. The Awkwardness of Denominationalism in the Face of Equality of Christians before God.

IV. There is No Alternative: Church History Must Be Rewritten.

V. The Hurt to Christianity Through Denominational "Voices" — the Denominational School and the Denominational Paper.

VI. Can the World be Christianized by a Denominational Christianity?

VII. What is the Hope for the Cure of the Scandal?

This book has been in the hands of reviewers for the last three months. Many have given lengthy reviews, some editorial reviews. It has been commended and attacked. *The Survey* says: "It is a blazing, blistering excoriation of the whole denominational system. The whole system is utterly and pathetically inadequate to meet the needs of to-day." The *Times-Union*, Albany, N. Y., says: "It is frank, honest and unusually readable."

Pages 212 ***Price $2.00***

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY
230 N. FULTON AVENUE
BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

PRINTED IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE

The
Christian Unity League

Will Hold a Conference

at

St. George's Church

New York City

November 13-15, 1929

This Conference is based on the Reconciliation Pact, which reads as follows:

> "We, Christians of various churches, believing that only in a coöperative and united Christendom can the world be Christianized, deplore a divided Christendom as being opposed to the Spirit of Christ and the needs of the world, and we are convinced that the Christianizing of the world is greatly hindered by divisive and rivaling churches.
>
> "We, therefore, desire to express our sympathetic interest in and prayerful attitude toward all conferences, small and large, that are looking toward reconciliation of the divided church of Christ; and we propose to recognize, in all our spiritual fellowships, the practice of equality of all Christians before God, so that no Christian shall be denied membership in our churches, nor a place in our celebration of the Lord's supper, nor pulpit courtesies be denied other ministers because they belong to a different denomination than our own; and, further, irrespective of denominational barriers, we pledge to be brethren one to another in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour, whose we are and whom we serve."

Among the personnel who are signers of the Pact are many of the most outstanding Christians in America. The Pact is definite and gets us somewhere. *The New Outlook,* Toronto, Canada, describes it as "a great step forward."

There is a growing desire in all denominations to abandon our unhappy divisions and to express a united brotherhood to the world. The Pact of Reconciliation attacks our attitudes and leaves open the door to a united Christendom. Signers are from nearly every state in the union and from nearly every denomination. The conference at St. George's church is open to the Christian public.

For further particulars address,

THE CHRISTIAN UNITY LEAGUE
230 N. FULTON AVE. BALTIMORE, MD.

L. XIX. No. 3 JANUARY, 1930

"God gave unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation"

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

CONTENTS

At the Editor's Desk
The New York Conference — The Protestant End of the Episcopal Bridge Dangles — Business and Church Standards Contrasted — Congregational and Christian Merger

Message to Christians in All the Churches from the Christian Unity League

The Equality of Christians . . . . . W. RUSSELL BOWIE

The Will to Unity . . . . S. M. ZWEMER

Denominations and Unity . . . . . RICHARD K. MORTON

What People and Papers Are Saying About Unity
Bishop Manning Forbids Dr. Coffin, a Presbyterian, to Celebrate the Lord's Supper in St. George's Church—Dr. Coffin Offers Own Church—Dr. Reiland's Letter — Dr. Ainslie's Defense of the League — Statement of Dissent from Thirteen Episcopal Rectors — Bishop Manning Usurped Authority in Opinion of Dr. Grammer — Sir Henry Lunn's Letter in the New York Times and Dr. Ainslie's Reply — One More Handicap to Church Unity — Freedom Under Law — A Graceless Bishop — A Courageous Bishop — Christian Unity Idealism Now on Bedrock — Recent Explosion Was a Good Thing — Is the Protestant Episcopal Church a Protestant Church?—The World Laughs Out Loud — The Plan of Union of the Congregational and Christian Churches — The Reunion of the Scottish Church

Book Reviews
Um Kirchliche Einheit — The Reunion of Christendom — The Bible Through the Centuries — The Social Sources of Denominationalism — What Happened in Palestine

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, Inc.
W. H. HOOVER, President
230 N. FULTON AVE., BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.
AGENTS:
Fleming H. Revell Company, New York
Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendal

A Statement

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the Unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are free to all indications of Christian Unity and Ventures of Faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all others who accept Jesus as Lord and Savior — are parts of the Church of Christ and that their Equality before God is the paramount issue of modern times.

Such a journal must, necessarily, be unofficial in its attempt to be an Interpreter of the mind of the churches and in furnishing a Forum for better understanding and cordial appreciation between the divided, and sometimes far isolated, communions of Christendom. It, thereby, seeks to contribute something to clear the way to the Altar of Reconciliation.

It does not hold itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors, except in a very general way as to their character and general attitude; but it invites to its pages such contributions of thought as will, on one hand, help in the removal of misunderstandings, and, on the other, create an atmosphere where our differences may be frankly faced and freely discussed in Christian Fellowship.

All contributors are allowed the same freedom in the expression of their thoughts, as the Editor exercises for himself. He does not anticipate that others will always approve his thoughts, any more than he presumes to assume responsibility for the thoughts of others; but every writer is responsible for what appears above his own name. We are to be free to think and equally free to let think, until, in corporate thinking and corporate praying, we find the Road to Brotherhood.

Consequently, this journal is not only not the organ of any party in Christendom; but, likewise, it is not the exponent of any theory of Christian Unity. It follows the reality in personal experience of spiritual growth in Christ — growing up in Him and toward other Christians as we find the Truth, which shall free us from suspicion, prejudice, pride, and unlove. Then we shall be able to interpret Christ in those terms which He expressed in His own words,—"By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have Love one to another."

CONTENTS

JANUARY, 1930

Vol. XIX. No. 3.

AT THE EDITOR'S DESK 195

THE NEW YORK CONFERENCE 195

THE PROTESTANT END OF THE EPISCOPAL BRIDGE DANGLES 201

BUSINESS AND CHURCH STANDARDS CONTRASTED 204

CONGREGATIONAL AND CHRISTIAN MERGER 205

MESSAGE TO CHRISTIANS IN ALL THE CHURCHES FROM THE CHRISTIAN UNITY LEAGUE 207

THE EQUALITY OF CHRISTIANS. W. Russell Bowie 212

THE WILL TO UNITY .... S. M. Zwemer 223

DENOMINATIONS AND UNITY. . Richard K. Morton 225

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY 234

BOOK REVIEWS 282

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

230 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES:—The Christian Union Quarterly is open to contributions from all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all other Christians who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour. It is entirely immaterial whether these contributions agree or disagree with the Editor's position, or the position of any contributor. We are seeking to bring together those who differ, for unless we frankly face our differences, and think them through, we shall never agree. The Christian Union Quarterly welcomes to its Forum all Ministers of Reconciliation.

PRICE:—The price of The Christian Union Quarterly, published in January, April, July, and October, is seventy-five cents a single copy, or two dollars and fifty cents a year, in the United States and all parts of the world. A local church of any communion contributing annually $5.00 or more to The Christian Union Quarterly Extension Fund will be entitled to receive two copies of The Quarterly free for one year—one copy going to the minister and the other copy to some designated person or institution.

Entered as second-class matter October 18th, 1923, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., U.S.A., under the Act of Congress of March 3rd, 1879.

The Christian Union Quarterly

EDITOR

Peter Ainslie, D.D., Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Beverley D. Tucker, Jr., D. D., Rector St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, Richmond, Va.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Dr. Hamilcar Alivisatos,
Athens, Greece.
Bishop Charles P. Anderson,
Chicago, Ill.
Rev. Nehemiah Boynton, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.
Dean Charles R. Brown,
New Haven, Conn.
Prof. William Adams Brown,
New York, N.Y.
Rev. Raymond Calkins, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass.
Bishop James Cannon, Jr.,
Washington, D.C.
Prof. Dr. J. Eugene Choisy,
Geneva, Switzerland.
Rev. S. D. Chown, D.D.,
Toronto, Canada.
Dr. J. A. Cramer,
Utrecht, Holland.
Prof. Dr. Adolf Deissmann,
Berlin, Germany.
Rev. A. W. Fortune, D.D.,
Lexington, Kentucky.
Dean H. E. W. Fosbroke,
New York, N.Y.
Dr. W. E. Garrison,
Chicago, Ill.
Principal Alfred E. Garvie,
London, England.
Most Rev. Metropolitan Germanos,
Thyatira, Asia Minor.
President W. A. Harper,
Elon College, N. C.
Dr. Henry T. Hodgkin,
Shanghai, China.
Rev. Finis S. Idleman, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.
Dean W. R. Inge,
London, England.
Prof. Rufus M. Jones,
Haverford, Pa.
Rev. Samuel McComb, D.D.,
Dresden, Germany.
Bishop Francis J. McConnell,
New York, N. Y.
Bishop William F. McDowell,
Washington, D.C.
Rev. William P. Merrill, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.
Dr. Wilfred Monod,
Paris, France.
Dr. C. C. Morrison,
Chicago, Ill.
Dr. John R. Mott,
New York, N.Y.
Bishop Harald Ostenfeld,
Copenhagen, Denmark.
Bishop Edward L. Parsons,
San Francisco, Calif.
President George W. Richards,
Lancaster, Pa.
Principal W. B. Selbie,
Oxford, England.
Pastor Dr. Friedrich Siegmund-Schultze,
Berlin, Germany.
Dr. Robert E. Speer,
New York, N.Y.
The Archbishop of Upsala,
Upsala, Sweden.
Dr. Henry van Dyke,
Princeton, N. J.
Rev. Joseph A. Vance, D.D.,
Detroit, Mich.
Bishop Boyd Vincent,
Cincinnati, Ohio.
The Archbishop of York,
York, England.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

JANUARY, 1930

AT THE EDITOR'S DESK

The New York Conference

The Christian Unity League is a loosely organized movement of persons in various churches. Its charter centers in the pact, which calls for the acknowledgment of all Christians as equal before God.

This pact came out of a series of experiments, trying to find where Christians are in their attitudes toward a united Christendom. It might have remained as an experiment, along with other experiments that have their records in our office. But conditions appeared to have been ripe to go forward and the call was made for a conference. The Christian Unity League had several conferences prior to the issuing of the pact last spring, feeling out the attitudes of Christians. But the New York conference at St. George's Protestant Episcopal church registered so high in its significance that the Christian Unity League goes forth on a plea for the equality of all Christians before God. There are already a thousand signers to the pact; there must be many thousands and every signer is expected to secure other signers.

The position of the pact involves some churches more than others, but Christians in all churches will be more or less affected by it. Does your church hold that, because of some theological or ecclesiastical position, it is better than all other churches, or certain other churches? Has your church barriers, prohibiting other Christians because of this, that, or the other? Are Christians really equal before God, or are there preferences in God's sight? Can Christian unity ever come until we recognize that Jesus Christ is our one teacher and all of us are brothers in the great family of God? Is denominationalism, with its separate organizations more or less hostile or unsympathetic toward each other, a Christian condition? What do *you* propose to do about it?

These questions and others like them arise out of the present condition in the churches. There is a call and there is a challenge for an evolution that asks of Christians in all our churches, not to set other churches in order, but to set their own churches in order. It must be done in prayer and suffering. It is the call of Jesus and that was his way in the days of his flesh. Since he is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, it must be his way still. Certainly our present conditions are contrary to his Spirit and the needs of the world.

The New York conference at St. George's church, November 13-15, afforded a field for adventure toward these ideals. St. George's gave a fine hospitality to the conference, which was composed of Christians from various churches as far east as Maine, as far south as North Carolina, as far west as Missouri, and as far north as Canada. Never has there met in America a finer group of men and women. The conference was on a high plane of thought from the beginning and moved steadily forward in frank and unafraid discussion of delicate questions. All had signed the pact, consequently there was no disposition to go back of the pact, discussing petty questions and setting up evasive attitudes. We have come to the day when many believe that all Christians are equal before God.

Wednesday afternoon was a period of prayer. That evening Dr. W. H. Foulkes, Presbyterian, Newark, N. J., conducted the devotional period and Dr. Karl Reiland, the rector of St. George's church, gave greetings to the League. Mr. Robert Fulton Cutting, the senior warden of St. George's church, spoke on "The Need of a United Christendom," and Dr. W. Beatty Jennings, Presbyterian, of Philadelphia, on "What a United Church Can Do that a Divided Church Cannot Do." Thursday morning opened with the devotional period conducted by Dr. Finis S. Idleman, Disciple, New York. Dr. Beverley D. Tucker, Jr., Episcopalian, Richmond, Va., spoke on "How Much Christian Unity Do We Now Have?" with discussion opened by Dr. J. S. Ladd Thomas, Methodist, Philadelphia. Dr. J. W. Woodside, United church, Ottawa, Canada, spoke on "Recent Evidences of Growth toward Christian Unity," with discussion by Dr. S. D. Chown and Dr. T. Albert Moore, both of the United church of Canada. The merger of the Congregationalists and Christians was presented by Dr. C. E. Burton, Congregationalist, and Dr. W. H. Haines, Christian.

Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, Methodist, New York, conducted the devotional period in the afternoon. Dr. C. C. Morrison, Disciple, Chicago, spoke on "The End of a Cycle in Protestantism" with discussion opened by Dr. Philip Snead Bird, Presbyterian, Cleveland. Dr. Robert Norwood, Episcopalian, New York, closed the afternoon session with a survey of the day's thinking. In the evening Dr. Morris H. Turk, Congregationalist, Maine, conducted the devotional and President Daniel L. Marsh, Methodist, Boston, spoke on "Possibilities of Attaining Christian Unity" and Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, Congregationalist, New York, on "What Would be the Attitude of Jesus toward a Divided Church?"

The last day was opened with the devotional period conducted by Dr. J. A. MacCallum, Presbyterian, Philadelphia. In this session the pact was revised and the Message to Christians, Dr. Ernest F. Tittle, Methodist, Chicago, chairman, with Dr. Norwood and Dr. MacCallum as vice-chairmen, was passed. It will be found on another page. In the afternoon Dr. J. M. Shaw, United church, Canada, conducted the devotional period, followed by three addresses. Dr. G. W. Richards, Reformed, Lancaster, Pa., spoke on "Shall we Continue our Emphases on Orthodoxy and Conformity Rather than on Purposes and Objectives?" with discussion by Dr. Frank K. Sanders, Congregationalist, Massachusetts, and Dr. John Ray Ewers, Disciple, Pittsburgh. Dr. W. H. P. Faunce, Baptist, Providence, R. I., spoke on "Our Obligation to the Future to Hasten a United Church" and Mr. Stanley High, Methodist, New York, on "The Call of the Future for a United Church."

The celebration of the Lord's supper in the evening was transferred to the chapel of Union Theological Seminary where Dr. Henry S. Coffin, Presbyterian, New York, was the celebrant, assisted by Dr. Reiland, Episcopalian, Dr. Norwood, Episcopalian, and Dr. MacMullen, Methodist. The choir of St.

George's church rendered the music. It was a beautiful and worshipful close to the conference.

The original plan was to celebrate the Lord's supper at St. George's church, which has no altar, but instead has a table as may be found in many Presbyterian churches. But the bishop of the Protestant Episcopal diocese of New York, Bishop William T. Manning, issued an order prohibiting Dr. Coffin from celebrating the Lord's supper there because he was a Presbyterian and not an Episcopalian. As to whether the bishop was right or wrong in the technical interpretation of the canons of the Episcopal church is a matter for Episcopalians to decide, but the principle involved belongs to all Christians. There are differences of opinion in the Episcopal church on the technical point and we give space on another page to these opinions. There are likewise opinions from those outside the Episcopal church on the principle involved and we give space on another page to some of these. We also give space to an opinion of a man of the world. It might not be out of place to have even Jesus say a word — "One is your teacher and you are all brothers."

It is well to keep in mind that the service proposed was to be non-Episcopal in an Episcopal church that had been loaned to the Christian Unity League. There are many instances where the Episcopal church has loaned its buildings to other churches for non-Episcopal services. But when the bishop protested against Dr. Coffin celebrating the Lord's supper in an Episcopal building St. George's wisely yielded to this protest. While in the minds of most people the bishop violated the laws of Christian ethics, it would be interesting and valuable if the Episcopalians were to work out, at their leisure, whether the bishop was right or wrong in his interpretation of the canon law. If he was right are the Episcopalians courageous enough to change their canon laws from a sectarian to a Christian standard? Can they change their canon law from sectarian to Christian without the church of England concurring? Or are we to understand that when the Episcopalians talk about Christian unity it is really a call for Protestants to be episcopally ordained? Not a bad idea, but is that what they mean? There is no field where we ought to be so absolutely frank as in approaches to Christian unity.

When Roman Catholics talk Christian unity everybody understands that it is that we must not only be episcopally ordained, but ordained by the Roman episcopacy if we would have valid orders and unite with the church of Rome. It is Rome or nothing. And it has some merit of consideration, especially that priestly orders started with the Roman Catholic church. Now does the Protestant Episcopal church hold the same position? Likewise it has in it some merit of consideration. Is the priesthood with its mythological heritage of apostolic succession a vital factor in Christianity? If so, which priesthood? Rome does not recognize the validity of the priestly orders of the Episcopalians, and there you are, for taking it, all in all, Rome appears to hold the key to the validity of priestly orders. And so the Episcopalians do not recognize the orders of the Presbyterians. We are mixed up in a nursery game, where children act ugly at their play — little children all dressed up, making faces at each other! After all has been said is not the position of Bishop Manning the same as that of the Disciples and the Baptists and Lutherans and about four fifths of the denominations of Christendom? It is accepting their sectarian position or there is no Christian unity. It is no surprise that the churches merit the contempt of the modern mind.

At the Lausanne faith and order conference in 1927 it was proposed from the platform by the editor of this journal to close the conference with a celebration of the Lord's supper by an episcopally ordained priest, Bishop Charles H. Brent being named as the celebrant, but it could not be done for fear a piece of the bread or a drop or two of the wine might be taken by a Presbyterian or a Methodist or a Baptist. Such sacrilege could not be tolerated! The editor of this journal thinks "scandal" is a mild term to be used to describe this condition. Perhaps, it might be well to employ some of the phrases that Jesus applied to the ecclesiastics of his day, or that Paul used regarding the worldliness of his day. But the use of these phrases would doubtless be as futile now as then.

There is a humorous side, however. The Roman Catholics demand of Bishop Manning, the other bishops, and the clergy of the Protestant Episcopal church that they be episcopally ordained by Rome if they would have union with Rome. On the other hand most of the Baptist and Disciple churches would require of Bishop Manning and the other bishops and clergy of the Episcopal church that they be rebaptized, many of these churches repudiating the phrase "rebaptism" but would plainly demand the one baptism by immersion if they would unite with their churches. The fact of the matter is that Bishop Manning has been very mild. He is the servant of a system that has its roots in the middle ages. But what has all this got to do with the religion of Jesus? Nothing at all.

Personally, we do not dissent from reordination whether episcopally done or otherwise, if thereby the church of God could be one. We would be willing to be reordained by the two hundred and fifteen American varieties of Christians, from episcopal ordination to the ordination by the Two-seed in the Spirit Predestinarian Baptists—if these can show to the slightest degree any advantaged fruit of the Spirit in the ordination that they have received. It is a fine issue that has been raised and we are grateful to Bishop Manning for raising it.

The incident was helpful to the conference and it is likewise helpful to the cause of Christian unity. We came to the place where we ceased playing checkers and instead came out in the open, revealing a hidden scandal that had been concealed by outward courtesies through the years. It furnishes a good beginning place. Perhaps, not now, but later we will find how these positions can be reconciled, for reconciliation must come if the churches are going to be Christian.

Another conference will be held at St. George's in 1930. A continuation committee was appointed and the New York conference of the Christian Unity League has passed into history as one of the most significant conferences in approach to Christian unity. We did indeed turn the corner. Every person who is willing to sign the pact is asked to do so and to secure other signatures. We are not dealing with church organizations. We are dealing with Christians in the various churches. The discussion in the conference recognized that. Discussions, motions, and amendments moved so easily that the chairman was able with slight confusion, in one of the sessions, to write a letter to Bishop Manning in consequence of his attack on the Christian Unity League in the press. This letter will be found on another page.

The denominational connection of the speakers has been mentioned in this article in order that our readers in all parts of the world might be interested in observing the activities of various denominations in this work. However, at the top of the printed program were these words: "In this program the denominations with which the participants are necessarily identified are purposely omitted. It is sufficient to know that all the participants are known in their localities and throughout the nation as followers of Jesus Christ."

The proceedings will appear in book form. Conferences of the League will succeed conferences until every part of the country has heard the call for the acknowledgment by all Christians of the equality of all Christians before God. Christian unity cannot come by waiting for something to turn up. But Christians are commissioned to turn the corner of the road and make brotherhood a reality in the Christian experiences of mankind. The New York conference was a great blessing and, by the grace of God, the people there lent their spirits to an interpretation that definitely directs our first move toward Protestant unity and then toward the larger unity of all Christendom; and, perhaps, toward the unity of all Catholic groups, which will be equally as stubborn, if not more so, and, therefore, longer reaching the equality of ordination, than the Protestant groups. But a united Christendom has got to come or Christianity will perish from the earth.

The Protestant End of the Episcopal Bridge Dangles

WHEN Bishop Manning of New York allowed our Eastern Orthodox brethren the use of the cathedral of St. John the Divine and then a few months later forbade Dr. Henry Sloan

Coffin, a Presbyterian, to celebrate the Lord's supper in St. George's church, which had been loaned to the Christian Unity League, all the talk of the Protestant Episcopal church being the *via media* went up in smoke. It was a fine courtesy to loan the cathedral to our Eastern Orthodox brethren—and we were pleased to know that it was done—but when a similar courtesy was refused to our Protestant brethren in a Christian unity conference, Bishop Manning broke the Protestant end of the Episcopal bridge — and we are sorry that he did it.

While to many non-Episcopalians the bridge theory was always fictitious, yet others of us supported it heartily. We had frequently quoted Bishop Manning and other bishops of the Protestant Episcopal church, sincerely believing that while the Protestant Episcopal church was Catholic, it maintained, more or less, an equal hospitality to Protestants. St. George's in New York, St. Paul's in Richmond, and scores of other Protestant Episcopal churches maintained that equality of attitude. On the other hand we knew that there were scores of Protestant Episcopal churches, controlled by the Anglo-Catholic party, which gave little quarter to Protestants. And so we felt that Dr. Manning, as bishop of a diocese where there were both of these elements represented, would be statesman enough to allow a church in his diocese which was inclined to express hosiptality to Protestants to do so, as he allowed churches in his diocese which are thoroughly Anglo-Catholic to express their hospitality to Catholic practices, and thus preserve the *status quo* of the bridge theory.

But not so. To Bishop Manning the time appeared to have come when the Protestant Episcopal church must line up on the Catholic side, and it did. It is not a question of canon law which we are discussing in this article: it is purely a question of Christian ethics. Bishop Manning could have done otherwise than he did because other bishops have done otherwise. His decision has put the Protestant Episcopal church completely in the Catholic column, closing out any hospitality to Protestants, other than such humane hospitality as might be extended to Jews or Masons.

We recognize, of course, that it is difficult to hold a middle ground on any subject, particularly if it is a subject calling for much discussion. Sooner or later one must take one side or the other. It is as proper for the Protestant Episcopal church to move toward Roman Catholicism as toward Protestantism. Both are Christian and, in the procession toward a united Christendom, the smaller unit must gravitate toward the larger unit. Before there can be a united Christendom, the Protestant bodies must unite, forming a large unit; likewise the episcopal bodies must unite, forming another large unit. These two large units must be the consummation of the struggle and conference and prayer through the years. We are sympathetically interested both in the unifying of the Protestant units and in the unifying of the episcopal units. By the time these two great units have reached their consummation we will find how Catholicism and Protestantism can unite. Until then our primary interest must be for the unifying of fragmentary Protestantism into one unit and for the unifying of fragmentary episcopates into another unit. If they move too slow, perhaps, God will find other outlets for the functioning of his will in the lives of men and women. Certainly all these units have got to take seriously the necessity of establishing attitudes which reveal to the world's eye that Jesus is expecting his followers to be a brotherhood, or his religion is jeopardized beyond helping mankind toward God.

An ordinary broken bridge is dangerous. It is not sufficient to put up a sign "Keep off." It needs to be repaired or removed. Since Bishop Manning's ruling the Protestant end of the Episcopal bridge dangles in the air. Is it to be left dangling in the air? Or will the Episcopalians repair the Protestant end by establishing equal hospitality to Protestants as to Catholics? It is a fine question, which only our Episcopal brethren can answer. They cannot afford to dodge the question lest they be involved in insincerity. Bishop Manning has rendered a service by bringing this whole subject into the clear. The Episcopalians cannot afford to closet it. They must answer it as frankly as the Roman Catholics answer on the papacy, or as most Baptists and most Disciples would answer on baptism by immersion. It is the old controversy between Jesus and dogma. After all shall he be allowed to unite his followers?

Business and Church Standards Contrasted

Among the many letters that have come to us relative to the incident in prohibiting the celebration of the Lord's supper at the Christian unity conference at St. George's church, New York, we publish the following paragraph from one of the letters:

> "For fifteen years the writer of this letter was employed as sales manager or salesman by several of the largest manufacturers in this country. It is a fact that it is considered dishonorable for a man to take money of a corporation and ridicule its policies or create dissention within its ranks. The trouble with me is that I expected as high an ethical standard in the church as I had found in business, and am shocked at finding myself disappointed."

This naïve approach to a condition that is so notorious furnishes an opportunity to say a word on a subject around which there is so much confusion. The writer of this letter evidently failed to take into consideration that there are two hundred and fifteen distinct communions in this country, each claiming to be either *the church* or *a church better than all other churches*—a dishonorable course to start with, particularly that the claim is not true, for every one of these two hundred and fifteen communions is under indictment by the laws of nature and by the principles upon which Christianity is founded. The religion of Jesus is a brotherhood; these two hundred and fifteen communions deny that his religion is a brotherhood by the perpetuation of their separate communions. Of course the standard of the business world is higher than the standard of the divided church. It is the question whether the larger loyalty, which belongs to Jesus, should subordinate itself to the lesser loyalty, which belongs to the communion of which one is a member. Never!

If one of these manufacturing establishments referred to were doing a dishonorable business, it would be the duty of every employee, irrespective of what the employer said, to attempt to set up a moral standard in keeping with the times rather than submit to the dishonorable policy of the establishment. It is, likewise, the duty of every Christian, whatever be his communion, to contend against this dishonorable condition in the church, which a divided and man-made Christendom has forced upon us, and, at every hazard, to insist on the practice of brotherhood around Jesus, our common Lord and Saviour, as the purpose of the gospel and the need of the world. He will be criticized by the denominationally-minded, whether they be in office or out of office, and, in some instances, he may be dismissed, as the dishonorable employer, perhaps, would do to his employee who sought to set up better moral standards in business than his employer had instructed him to do.

Of course the divided church would not endorse such a course, but the fair-minded would. It is the way that truth finds its outlets. Never were there so many Christians in the various communions who are working for these higher and better standards. The readiness with which more than a thousand persons in the various communions signed the Christian unity pact proves this. The issue has gradually been coming into the clear. There is already a multitude of the unafraid.

Congregational and Christian Merger

THE coming together of the Congregational and Christian churches is the beginning of Protestant unity in the United States. It is a contribution in catholicity and autonomy. Whether they attain complete organic unity is interesting of course, but the fact that these two Protestant bodies have, by the action of their national gatherings, formed a merger is of primary interest. They are free churches, congregational in polity, and union will have to come largely through the local congregations.

It rightly belonged to these two communions to lead in this cause. Both have been outspoken for Christian unity and both were free to make the adventure. The backgrounds of both were set to larger fellowships than either could possibly have in their separate capacities. It was not like the recent union of the two Presbyterian communions in Scotland, where they had lived side by side and belonged to the same denominational family; neither was it like the union of the Cumberland Presbyterians with the Presbyterian church in the U.S.A., where the former was absorbed by the latter; but, in the merger of these two American communions, both remain unchanged except their fellowships have been widened. Their convention groups will become educational forces for closer union. There the leaders of both communions will think and pray together sympathetically. Almost without plans they will find themselves growing into unity, which is far more healthy than being tied up by creedal agreements and great theological expositions, which another generation will seek to revise for larger freedom. It is much better to put these things into a common trust among each other than on paper.

Legal questions are among their problems. There is forever the appearance of the dead hand when we talk about Christian unity. Legal questions come to the front at once. Long years ago money was left to perpetuate these particular brands of Christianity, as is the case with all denominations, and there are other legal restrictions having to do with the perpetuation of a divided Christendom. As these laws were made in a time when everybody thought denominationalism was right, has the time not come, since multitudes are discovering the impropriety of denominationalism, that a Federal law should be passed making it less difficult to handle such questions?

But the Congregationalists and Christians are moving as rapidly as possible in the adjustment of those things that are possible now. The consolidation of their denominational journals, which will be done this spring, is a valuable step, also their common year book, then their missionary boards and educational institutions, so that no one of these shall be in the exclusive control of the other communion. The fact that the merger makes a body in excess of a million is secondary by the side of the spirit and adjustments that are put into the merger.

MESSAGE TO CHRISTIANS IN ALL THE CHURCHES FROM THE CHRISTIAN UNITY LEAGUE

THE Christian Unity League, assembled in conference at St. George's church, New York city, November 13-15, 1929, adopted the following:

Results Already Achieved in the Direction of Christian Unity

The past decade has witnessed significant advances toward church federation, as seen in the constantly expanding program of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. There have been, likewise, some notable examples of church union. In Canada, Methodist, Congregational, and Presbyterian churches have united to form the United church of Canada. In Scotland, the church of Scotland and the United Free church have reunited. In the Philippine Islands, a union of the Congregational, Presbyterian and United Brethren churches has been consummated. In Japan, south China, and southern India similar unions have been formed of the missionary churches of the Methodist, Presbyterian, Reformed, and Congregational denominations.

Notable also is the fact that in the United States a union has been consummated between the Congregational and Christian churches, and between certain Lutheran groups; also, plans are under way for the merger of the Reformed church, the United Brethren, and the Evangelical Synod. Several churches have appointed commissions "to make overtures to and to receive overtures from like-minded churches looking toward closer coöperation and unification." Commissions so appointed are now holding conferences to consider the possibility of organic union between the Congregation-Christian churches and the Disciples of Christ, between the Presbyterian church, U. S. A., and the United Presbyterian church, and between the Methodist Episcopal church and the Presbyterian church, U. S. A., and between the Northern Baptist church and the Disciples of Christ. The spirit of these conferences has been well expressed by the commissions representing the Methodist Episcopal church and the Presbyterian church of the U.S.A., who say:

"The union of which some of our leaders have dared to dream is very inclusive. There has come before their minds the bright vision of a movement in which many, even if not all, of the Protestant groups might be comprised. . . . But whatever the future may bring to us both of broader opportunities for fellowship, our thoughts are centered to-day on this fraternal meeting with its possibilities of initiating a movement which may count mightily for the progress of the Christian church in this country and beyond. We come into this meeting laying down no conditions; making no mental reservations. We assume that we are one in the essentials of the gospel of Jesus Christ, and that in any agreement which may be reached those essentials will constitute the platform on which unitedly we may stand. . . . If providentially we shall be led into a visible and organic unity which shall express more perfectly the spiritual unity already existing, if God can use us together better than he can use us separately to exalt Jesus Christ and to extend his kingdom, we shall have no regrets, even if to secure such an end involves the sacrifice of some of our traditions and our habits."

It is evident that the great conferences held in Stockholm, 1925, at Lausanne, 1927, and at Jerusalem, 1928, have stimulated the movement for Christian unity. It is also evident that Christian unity is being called for by such facts as these:

On the part of churchmen the world around there has been a decrease of doctrinal emphasis and an increase of moral concern for the future of mankind. On the part of Christian nationals of foreign mission fields there has been a growing demand for a united church which shall seek, not to perpetuate the historic divisions of the west, but to embody the noblest faith and highest aspirations of the east. On the part of Christian laymen in the west, and particularly in the United States, there has been a growing dissatisfaction with the economic waste and moral inefficiency of denominational competition. Laymen who, outside their churches, find themselves closely associated in commercial and civic enterprises, see no reason why in their churches they should be divided. The increasing number of so-called "community churches" is probably a significant symptom of this fact. On the part of far-seeing Christians everywhere there is a growing conviction that Christianity is fundamentally a way of life, sharply distinct from sectarianism in both philosophy and morals, and that under present conditions the church of Christ can hardly hope to lead the world into his way of life if it is itself disunited.

The Basis of Christian Unity

The League is deeply impressed by the significance of the obvious fact of Christian history, that attempts to base Christian unity upon any statement of beliefs held in common has always led, and must always lead, not to unity but to division and controversy. Sincere and earnest men think differently about religion as about everything else, and find the way to coöperation less by attempts to formulate their convictions than by devotion to their common tasks. Statement of Christian conviction there ought always to be in every group and age, but the great goal of Christian unity lies at the end of another road.

Believing that Christianity is primarily a way of life in which we move forward together with all those who, through the centuries and throughout the world, have shared, and now share, the Christian faith in one God and Father of us all, the Christian experience of the redemptive power of the life and death of Jesus Christ our Lord, and the Christian purpose to extend on earth the kingdom of God, we find our consciousness of Christian brotherhood impoverished and the effectiveness of our Christian service sorely weakened by our present sectarian divisions. We cannot face the doing of the will of God for our generation and the building of a more Christian world for our children after us, as these tasks have been laid upon our mind and conscience by what we believe is the spirit of the living

God, without a larger measure of Christian unity, not only in spirit, but in effective organization. We believe that the road toward such unity, the farther reaches of which we cannot yet clearly perceive, lies plainly in the direction of a braver cooperative adventure between all Christian groups in the effort together to extend the kingdom of God both in our local communities and throughout the world. And we call upon all those who share that conviction to seek with us this larger influence of the spirit of Christ in all organized Christian life and work.

Practical Measures

As practical measures for Protestants to take in the direction of Christian unity we suggest the following:

1. Discussion of the subject of Christian unity by ministers in their own pulpits, ministerial associations, councils of churches, denominational assemblies, local, sectional, and national conferences.

2. Interchange of pulpits by ministers of different communions.

3. Encouragement wherever feasible of the practice of calling and receiving ministers from one communion to another.

4. The reception of members from one communion to another by letter on terms of complete equality.

5. The encouragement of the union of congregations of different communions wherever practicable.

6. Encouragement of the union of separate groups within denominational families, looking to the ultimate union of the whole church.

7. The coöperation in aims and plans of the missions of all Christian churches, looking toward the speedy unification of all missionary work in one church.

8. Similar unification of the work of religious education.

8-A. Provision for courses of study on Christian unity in colleges, universities and theological seminaries.

8-B. That the obligations and essentials of Christian unity be taught to the boys and girls of our Sunday-schools.

9. The encouragement of coöperative agencies, such as the

Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, inclusive missionary boards, interdenominational religious educational organizations and similar vehicles for the free expression of the spirit of all churches seeking union.

10. The appointment, by the chairman, of a continuation committee, with advisory powers only.

11. We rejoice in the adopted Pact of Christian Unity as the crowning expression of this conference and commend to the churches its widest possible use.

CREEDS AND DEEDS

Words, words, words —
  How empty they may be!
Eyes, eyes, eyes —
  But blind and cannot see!
"Lord, Lord" is a confession vain,
Like chaff, without the golden grain,
  Unless our deeds agree.

Creeds, creeds, creeds —
  Engraven on a page!
Creeds, creeds, creeds —
  Prized only for their age!
"Lord, I believe" are words in vain,
If Christ lives not in us again
  Our creed and life to gage.

Life, life, life —
  With pulsing love aglow!
Deeds, deeds, deeds —
  To soothe another's woe:
And thus would I my creed explain,
While in my life Christ lives again,
  For all to see and know.

—*Edgar Cooper Mason.*

THE EQUALITY OF CHRISTIANS*

BY REV. W. RUSSELL BOWIE, D. D.
Rector of Grace Protestant Episcopal church, New York city

. . . *For one is your teacher, and all ye are brethren.*—Matthew 23:8.

THESE words make clear the thought of Christ in contrast to some of the thoughts of those who are supposed to be his followers.

He was speaking to his disciples and pointing out to them the way in which he wanted them to be different from the leaders of the church of Israel. It was on a day late in Jesus' ministry, and apparently he was standing in the temple. There in front of him may have passed the figures of the scribes and the Pharisees, going importantly about their business. Some of them were persons of high official consequence. They were strong in precedents and prerogatives. They taught a religion in which everything was set down in black and white, and in which new conclusions must be proved from the old code. They knew the way of salvation, and they proposed to administer it officially. They had made strait the gate of salvation and they stood on guard to see that none should come into the household of God unless he entered through that narrow gate. They considered that they had authority from God, and with unbending conscience they intended to use it.

Looking at them, Jesus drew the little group of men whom he loved around him and gave them a new ideal. They were not to seek authority. They were not to imagine that religious unity was a thing of letter and of law. Their unity was to be a more living thing. "All ye are brethren," he said; and the spirit of their brotherhood should be the spirit which they saw in him. His teaching was not so much in formal pronouncements as in his life. So must theirs be. His authority was not in what he assumed, but in what he gave. So must theirs be. He, the greatest, had stooped to be servant of all. So must they.

---

* Sermon preached on Sunday following the New York Conference of the Christian Unity League.

If his purpose for them should be summed up in two phrases, they might be these — the equality of all Christians and the centrality of Christ. His followers are to belong to a brotherhood in which there are no assumptions of superiority, and in which the touchstone of all its thought and life must always be the thought of Jesus.

Yet, as a matter of fact, the development of Christian history has seen the violation of both his purposes. We have broken the Christian brotherhood, and we have made other things more controlling than the mind of Christ.

That we have broken the Christian brotherhood needs little arguing. Christianity is rent with divisions which are a scandal to our conscience. Here in the United States there are more than two hundred various ecclesiastical bodies, all invoking the name of Jesus.

That means waste. It means the loss of fellowship and often the development of acrimonious rivalry. It means the failure of Christianity to make its possible impact upon the life of the world.

I remember attending once a convention on rural life, one of the themes of which was the relation of the country church to its community. On the walls of the assembly-room were many charts and pictures, which graphically represented the subjects under discussion. Among these was a large photograph of a group of churches standing side by side near the cross-roads of a village. There they were, so near together that a person could almost lean out of the window of one of the buildings and touch the wall of the next, all of them shabby and insignificant, yet representing four religious bodies, each one of which was determined at all cost to outlast the other. It was a bedraggled line, but there they stood crowding out in resolute right angles to the dusty road. The picture was entitled simply "Four in a Row." As I stood regarding it, a man came up, paused and looked at it, and then, half aloud and quite seriously, he read it as he supposed it was. He thought the "row" was meant to be something different from the mere straight line which the prosaic labeller of the picture had doubtless intended. It was the word which rhymes with "how" which he thought was there, and that was the way he read it, "Four in a *Row,*" he said to himself, and passed on. So it is. Four in a row. Four, or perhaps more, in a snarl and a bicker. Four in a more or less polite brawl, instead of in a brotherhood.

The trouble is that our passion for enshrining our little particular views of religion has interested us more than religion itself. While we have been contentiously busy building our peculiar kinds of cages to keep it in, religion like a bird has flown away.

There is a fable which very pertly expresses the fact. It runs thus: A man was walking one day with the devil, and on the road ahead of them walked another man. The man ahead stopped, and stooping, picked up something from the ground. The man walking beside the devil clutched the devil's arm. "Did you see what the man picked up?" he said. "Yes, I saw it," replied the devil. "Well, you take it very coolly," his fellow-traveler replied. "Aren't you afraid of what it may do to you? Do you realize that what he picked up was a piece of pure truth?" "Yes, I realize it," said the devil, "but I know exactly what to do so that his pure truth cannot de me any harm." "What will you do?" "I will tempt him to organize it."

Often the devil must be ironically content with the success of his temptation. Often it would appear that we have organized truth to death. We have ground it up in the midst of the thoroughly correct and conscientious wheels of our ecclesiastical machines.

Who can contemplate the reality of these things without distress and shame? They mean, as we have already suggested, waste, divisions and weakness.

Waste. That word could be turned into statistics. It would be possible to figure out how many millions of dollars are continually being wasted by the duplications of church buildings, and in the payment of the salaries of ministers and missionaries who, instead of being fellow-laborers, are merely ecclesiastical competitors in a struggle to push new missions under denominational names into territories where only an undivided church ought to go.

Division. We might think of that generally, but it is better to think of it particularly. Here in New York three days ago, in connection with the Christian Unity Conference — God save the mark — we have a new illustration of our pitiful divisions. It is inconceivable that Jesus himself would be reluctant to have his followers of different names come together at the communion in the spirit of his own words, "This is my commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you." It is inconceivable that Jesus would stand at the door of a church and shut the door in the face of some of his disciples because they belonged to one kind of organization rather than another. And yet we are confronted with the melancholy fact that, in his name, exactly these things are done. It is an illustration of the way in which ecclesiastical officials can become so rigidly concerned with the secondary rules and definitions that they can completely obscure the primary ends of Christ.

It is not a question of the desire of any individual to block the purposes of Christ. No one will question the sincerity of the ruling which prevented the communion service that was to have been held in St. George's church. But the tragedy is that through accumulated pre-judgments and rigidities of mind, for which whole groups of Christians are responsible, we have created a situation in which it can sincerely be held more important to insist upon the letter of canons than to give play to the possibilities of Christ.

And all this is meaning weakness and futility. That is the grave aspect of it. It is not only a matter of economic waste and not only a matter of individual bad manners. It is a matter of the failure of Christianity to bring to bear upon the world the effective power of God. Here we are in this twentieth century, confronted by gigantic moral and social needs. We are faced with a well-fed and confident materialism which justifies itself in theory and parades itself in fact. And the Christian gospel cannot prevail against it when it speaks with a distracted and a discordant voice. Here are great social and industrial problems waiting for a spiritual dynamic which will help actually to order our practical affairs to the end of making better men and a more abundant life, rather than merely making more money. But Christianity cannot bring this dynamic when it is concerned with internecine disputes instead of with what ought to be its outgoing and redeeming power. Here is our critical opportunity to create both an ideal and a program of world peace that shall be proof against the irritations and the passions which lead to war. But the Christian church cannot effectively plead for peace in the world if it is unashamed at the lack of peace within itself. Meanwhile, the power of the possible influence which ought to be within the grasp of the Christians of our generation is beyond all reckoning. It represents a thrilling and an awful opportunity. If all the Christian idealism which now is so often dissipated through our divisions could be united, then, like the Christians who came long ago to Thessalonica, we could indeed "turn the world upside down" and set it God's side up.

But we must needs face not only the fact that Christianity is divided, but the more stubborn fact that many of the divisions are tied up with what men hold to be matter of conscience and with convictions which they claim to have received direct from God. Like the scribes in Israel long ago, the leaders of many Christian churches believe that they occupy by right the seat of Moses. The divine law is on their side, and that law they propose to apply.

It is plain that there are various Christian communions which, on this basis, can make an impressive showing. Each one has built round its particular position a barbed wire entanglement of logic which would seem to make its claim impregnable.

There is, for example, most conspicuously the church of Rome. Her assertions do not lack for categorical clearness. She claims that Jesus Christ intended to leave behind him a church strictly prescribed and accurately organized, and that this church, devised and instituted by him, is none other than the church of Rome. He told the apostles what the church was to do. He made Peter the head of the apostles and the head of the church. The popes are the successors of Peter, and therefore his successors in the church's headship, and outside this body of salvation there is no true and valid Christianity. "The truth is," said Pope Pius XI in his latest encyclical letter, "that Christ founded his church as a perfect society, of its nature external and perceptible to the senses, which in the future should carry on the work of the salvation of mankind under one head, with a living teaching authority, administering the sacraments which are the sources of heavenly grace. . . . There is but one way in which the unity of Christians may be fostered, and that is by furthering the return to the one true church of Christ of those who are separated from it; for from that one true church they have in the past fallen away. . . . Let them then, return to their Father, who, forgetting the insults in the past heaped upon the apostolic see, will accord them a most loving welcome."

And Cardinal Bourne, archbishop of Westminster, in commenting upon the pope's encyclical letter, has pronounced as follows: the church of Rome "is essentially unable to regard divine worship as a matter of opinion, sentiment, or uncertainty. Thus Catholics, while respecting the religious convictions of others and acknowledging their sincerity and good faith, are precluded from any action that would appear to call in question the objective truth of the revelation delivered to her by Jesus Christ our Lord. She must ever be, as she has been from the beginning, an *exclusive* church both in her teaching and in her worship.

"This, then, is the unchanging and unchangeable teaching of the Catholic church on unity, which the actual occupant of the papal chair authoritatively proclaims once more in terms that are quite clear."

It is obvious thus that the claims of the Roman church are sufficiently exclusive; but they are not unrivaled. The Eastern Orthodox church claims in its turn to be the representative of the real divine truth from which, partly by ignorance and partly by stubbornness, the rest of the Christian world has gone astray. And though it is true that the Eastern Orthodox church seems somewhat remote from our knowledge, and, in point of fact, therefore from our general interest here in America, there are others also beside the Greek church who take the same essential position of the church of Rome — that to them is committed a divine pattern of what the Christian organization ought to be. The Anglo-Catholics in our own communion have precisely this conviction.

In a chapter written by Bishop Manning of New York in a recent volume, entitled *The Reunion of Christendom,* the bishop expresses thus what he believes to be the attitude of our communion: "She holds that the faith and order of the church are from Christ himself, directly or through the promised guidance of the holy Spirit. The church is not a humanly organized society, a voluntary association of believers. It is a divine society, created and commissioned by Jesus Christ.

"Our Lord himself founded the church visibly here on earth; chose and commissioned its first ministers; instituted its visible ceremonies, the sacraments of baptism and the holy communion, to be continued for ever; promised to be with his church 'alway, even unto the end of the world.' . . . The only basis for a true reunion is our common acceptance of that which comes to us from Christ. We are called upon not to create the unity of the church, but to cease from obstructing and obscuring it, to manifest visibly our fellowship in Christ."

It is plain enough that, with this idea of the church, the process of reunion would be a very definite matter. There would be polite concessions on unimportant matters, but fundamentally reunion must be reunion on our basis. We are the people, and the misguided brethren must come back to our position. It sounds hopeful and inclusive to say that "the only basis for a true reunion is our common acceptance of that which comes to us from Christ," but in the background is the inflexible insistence that what comes from Christ himself is the faith and order of this church.

But it is not only those communions which have made the great word "Catholic" into a particular name that claim to have the one divinely authenticated kind of Christianity. The more extreme forms of Southern Baptists, for example, are removed from Roman Catholics and Anglo-Catholics in some matters as distantly as the poles, but they are blood-brothers to both of them in their tendency to claim supremacy as the agents of salvation. Nor are these claims less jealously guarded. A few days ago a Southern Baptist minister was declared heretical because he expressed the damaging opinion that persons might be saved without immersion, and followed this with additional heresy that immersion conducted by a person not a Baptist might be valid. When our Lord commanded his disciples to be baptized—according to the Baptist's conviction—he meant everything he said plus all its implications. In those days the method of baptism was immersion. *Ergo,* that must be the method forever, and no church is properly Christian which does not carry out this injunction of Jesus in the manner in which the Baptists consider that it must be understood. If the Roman Catholics are sure that Peter was given the keys to heaven, the Baptists are nonetheless sure that they possess the gate. It is a submarine gate, to be sure, but it is the only certain gate, nevertheless; and the only way to get into the kingdom of Heaven is to go through it.

Excellent logic, all of these arguments. Grant the premises, in each case, and the conclusions follow inescapably. Start on the given road, and you must go marching along to the end. But when the end is reached, we are a long way from Jesus.

Here, then, we face the crux of the whole matter. If it be true that a particular form of baptism, or a particular form of church government, represents divine will of our Lord, then manifestly we must follow out this will if we would be faithful Christians. But is it true? Did Jesus Christ ever set up a definite and exclusive ecclesiastical machinery, and ordain that Christian life and Christian loyalty could come forth only through its wheels?

I do not believe that he did. I wonder if any of us in our heart of hearts really believe that he did, when we think of him gathering that little group of friends round him long ago and saying, "One is your teacher, even Christ, and all ye are brethren."

Speaking now particularly of this communion of ours, I believe that it has a great contribution to make to Christendom. I believe that it has historic values which cannot be duplicated elsewhere. I believe that its rich and reverent consciousness of the inheritance of the ages, its sense of the church as an organic fellowship, including within itself all the long spiritual splendor of the martyrs and the saints, its beauty of liturgy, and its poetry of worship through which the lips of unnumbered generations have uttered the eternal longings of the human heart — all these, if lifted up in their own intrinsic winsomeness, will draw toward us the best impulses of American religious life. If we put forward our spiritual possessions not as obligations but as opportunities, we can become a rallying point for that unforced unity toward which the hearts of Christians everywhere are turning. But when we, or any other communion, assume that our tradition in this or that respect is infallible and beyond any real discussion or amendment; when we approach other Christians with the iron hand of dogmatism beneath the glove of superficial courtesy; and when we insist that our "faith and order" are not a great complex of divine and human elements, but an unchangeable title deed, sealed and stamped with God's own authority—then we alienate those whom we ought to win. We need the spirit for which Oliver Cromwell pleaded when he said once to an assembly in England, "I beseech you by the mercies of Christ that you consider it possible that you may be mistaken." For the truth is that on some of the things on which we have most rigidly insisted it is entirely possible that we may be mistaken. Some of our assumptions of superiority have debatable warrant in Scripture as well as an indubitably bad effect on Christian fellowship now.

Debatable warrant in Scripture. That is an understatement of the truth. The extreme High-Anglican claim that the constitution of this church rests upon precedents so primitive and so universal that they must represent the direct ordinations of Christ himself is a huge structure which rests upon a foundation of sand. Let a great scholar speak concerning this—not a scholar of a non-conformist church, but a scholar of the church of England. It is Canon Streeter of Oxford, one of the preëminent authorities on the history of the early church, who in the conclusion to his latest book has written: "Perhaps the greatest obstacle to reunion is the belief—entertained more or less explicitly by most bodies of Christians—that there is some one form of church order which alone is primitive; and which, therefore, alone possesses the sanction of apostolic precedent. Our review of the historical evidence has shown this belief to be an illusion. In the primitive church no one system of church order prevailed. Everywhere there was readiness to experiment, and, where circumstances seemed to demand it, to change."

We need that "readiness to experiment" here in American Christendom to-day. We need it in New York. We need more living interpretations of existing ecclesiastical laws, and we need a modification of those laws the effect of which is obviously un-Christian. Repeatedly in civil matters a court will declare some legislation on behalf of social progress unconstitutional, and a few years later other judges in that same court, or in a higher court, will pronounce it constitutional. The letter of the law remains exactly what it was before; but it has been more vitally interpreted in accordance with the realities of an expanding world. In the same way, it is possible for church laws to be increasingly interpreted in ways that make for inclusion and not for exclusion. And when church laws do definitely contradict the Spirit of Christ, then the sooner they are altered the better.

But it is not only because its historical warrant is uncertain that the spirit of superiority and exclusiveness in any church is wrong. Such a spirit stands in a graver condemnation. It is inconsistent with the mind of Christ. It exalts the church in the name of Jesus, but it has lost the real Jesus with whom the church began.

The exclusive church to-day, like the exclusive church of the scribes in Israel, bars the gate to those who do not conform to its particular pattern. But Jesus threw the gates wide to all the wistful people who came desiring God. The exclusive church is legalistic. But Jesus hated legalism and trusted to the Spirit. The exclusive church produces an autocracy of ecclesiastical pride. But Jesus said, "He that is greatest among you is he that does serve." The exclusive church talks in terms of canons and conformities. But Jesus spoke in terms of the hunger of human hearts. The exclusive church builds fences. But Jesus was forever breaking fences down, that from the north and the south and the east and the west men might come into the kingdom of God.

So at the end, as at the beginning, I would set the challenge of the suggestion of our text—the equality of Christians and the centrality of Christ. We have violated both of those ideals, and the fulness of our Christian life waits until we restore them both. I do not choose to conclude with detailed discussion of possible amendments to church laws, but rather with the great consideration of the direction in which all our changes and developments must move. Are we willing to think less of churchmanship and more of Christianity? Are we trying to build a kind of Christianity whose strength is not in barren logic but in love? Are we willing to submit every claim of the church to the test of whether or not, in actual fact, it works out to the result of helping men feel the spirit of Jesus? When we can answer yes to those questions, then and then only shall we move toward Christian reunion according to the mind of Christ.

FRIENDSHIP

Give holy care when lifting up
The goblet life has filled,
Lest from a seeming tiny cup
An ocean be outspilled.

—*Elinor Lennen.*

THE WILL TO UNITY

BY REV. S. M. ZWEMER, D. D.
Editor *The Moslem World,* Cairo, Egypt

If unity is Christ's will it must become our will. But our wills are never made willing—we never exercise the divinely given power of contrary choice—till our minds approve and our affections desire a given course of action. The psychology of faith and prayer is first to know, then to feel, and then to will. In this way and only in this way can a man lay hold of God. In this way and only in this way can men lay hold of each other and can there be unity of fellowship and a fellowship of Unity.

Intellectually I believe that most Christians are convinced of the desirability and necessity of greater unity in the body of Christ. To read the history of our divisions and sub-divisions, of sects and schisms and parties, of labels and libels, is enough to convince anyone that the unity for which our Lord prayed does not exist to-day. We have torn the seamless robe into fragments and Paul's sharp words to the different factions at Corinth have a present day application. They touch conscience to the quick.

The fellowship of unity, the communion of saints, the oneness of the body of Christ is not a distant dream or an impossible ideal to be realized in the New Jerusalem. It begins here and now. "Ye are members one of another." Even if we cannot agree on all matters of faith and ecclesiastical order we belong to one army and must march together. Face to face with a great Moslem majority the Christian minorities of the Near East may well remember the witty words of Benjamin Franklin to the thirteen colonies in their struggle for political independence in 1775: "If we do not hang together, we are all in danger of hanging separately." It is not however a question of safety or political liberty primarily. What is far more important is that we can only bear strong witness to the truth in Moslem lands when we present a united front.

The "week of witness" when we all engaged in literature distribution was a foretaste of the possibilities and joys of such united prayer and faith and effect in evangelism. Therefore, as Bishop Gore puts it: "Even if we must abandon for a time the present attempt at ecclesiastical unity we must still devote ourselves to the more feasible task of consolidating all those who profess the name of Christ, without regard to doctrinal and sacramental differences, in an earnest pursuit of the moral and social aims of Christianity. If we can learn to act as one body on the moral and social field, we may become better fitted in another generation to approach doctrinal and sacramental questions afresh."

But this can only be done by a will for unity—a determination not to wait but to move forward. The will of God is not passive, but active; not a pillow but a power-house; not a lullaby, but a battle-cry. We need to-day, not more knowledge but more love; not more theory but more patience.

"We know the path wherein our feet should press
Across our hearts are written thy decrees—
But now O Lord be merciful and bless—
With more than these.
Knowledge we ask not—knowledge thou hast given
But Lord the will—there lies our deepest need,
Grant us to build above the deep intent the deed, the deed."

This, like all spiritual processes, is in the last analysis the gift of God. "Of him and through him and unto him is the unity of the church and the fellowship of all believers."

S. M. Zwemer.

DENOMINATIONS AND UNITY

BY RICHARD K. MORTON
Harvard Theological Seminary, Cambridge, Mass.

Church unity is one of the major problems facing us today. Much that is noble and constructive has been said and written about it. The editor of *The Living Church,* in reviewing Dr. Peter Ainslie's book entitled *The Scandal of Christianity,*[1] reduces to concrete and specific considerations some of the definite problems involved in any project of church unity.

Many church leaders feel keenly the shortcomings of the denominational system, but Dr. Ainslie's term "scandal" is rather harsh and antagonizing. It seems to me that this characterization is unfair, for denominations arose after the Reformation in response to perfectly sincere and legitimate influences. The "scandal" is not in the fact of denominationalism, but what some propose to do with this now inadequate and even harmful method of church administration to-day. Dr. Ainslie rightly scores the manifold faults of the denominational system of to-day; but each denomination has and has had its great leaders, its high purposes, and its noble ideals.

Dr. Charles D. Eldridge has recently pointed out, in his valuable book,[2] many of the most noteworthy contributions of Christianity to civilization. I think that for the period immediately after the Reformation began denominationalism was the only phenomenon which could have arisen in history. The impetus, strength, and vigor of many new leaders and views in a time of danger, controversy, political and social unrest, and economic difficulties seem to me valuable.

The Reformation demonstrated the divisibility of the church — that people would depart from the established church for good reasons. A church, to be really united, must have freedom to divide, if necessary. In every country denominational divisiveness, whatever its shortcomings, has had its stimulating effect. It stimulated the Roman church to do something about its condition at the council of Trent. It brought forth Luther, Wesley, Calvin, and many others. It may be, of course, that in his comprehensive book Dr. Eldridge has classification as "contributions" ready for phenomena in religious life which were really only incidents or occurrences and which contributed nothing — if, indeed, some of them did not take away something from civilization.

---

[1] Editorial, "The Scandal of Christianity," April 13, 1929.

[2] *Christianity's Contributions to Civilization.*

In a recent article[3] I tried to point out some of the things which can be said for denominations; and I also mentioned some of the difficulties in the way of a genuine unity of the church. I find that the editor of *The Living Church* is also concerned about what the newly created church organization will stand for, and how it will function. One church without spiritual power and without a definite appeal to the whole of man and a way to serve him and bring him nearer to God will be even less effective than a number of denominations.

I think, however, that this great difficulty is not a serious bar to church unity. The fixity of belief and liturgy is always a danger to progress, although an aid to worship. But in what way will our religious life, governed by the principles we believe to be true, be better aided within the bounds of an exclusive denomination than within the inclusive bounds of a larger fellowship intelligently maintained? We disagree widely on certain points. Granted. But how can we do much about it by remaining off in fragmentary parts, which is what much denominationalism really amounts to? Could we not in the long run work out our problems together than by ourselves? No one has yet advanced a definite plan for doing so, but I believe the matter is not impossible.

We could for one matter teach as do the universities. They provide a general program of education, yet students take different courses, teachers have different views, and books present different aspects of problems. Denominationalism, too often, has confirmed a believer from his earliest days in superficial views of the whole field of religious thought. He seldom deeply examines other philosophies and theologies. Denominations have too often taken a traditional belief and then nobly evangelized to get as many as possible to join their banner, instead of trying to present many points of view and letting the prospective believer decide. Any great religious leader is inevitably limited by the boundaries of the denomination of which he is a part. There is grave question whether creeds as such will in the future be useful in describing the belief of church people. To codify and systematize is difficult and sooner or later unsatisfactory; but, on the other hand, to allow the church to stand for vague, vacillating, and uncertain ideas is dangerous. But I believe that people who want to know God and follow their highest ideals can get together in a church in some way. I see a real danger, however, in the possibility that the united church would not have a sufficiently emotional and missionary appeal. People emotionalize their religion more than they rationalize it, and if the church does not appeal to their deepest emotional life it will not have their support. A united church will be in some ways unwieldy, difficult to start or stop or administer, and difficult to interest in specific missionary or evangelizing projects, simply because of the diversity of purposes and interests represented.

---

[3] *Federal Council Bulletin*, April, 1929.

We may ask what the new church would stand for? But what does the divided church stand for, and are all of these competing groups getting anywhere toward it? The cold fact is that denominationalism is obviously blundering in its attempt to meet the needs of the new day.

Of course, much remains to be done. The new church must have some kind of a theology and method of worship and administration. Different members cannot agree on many points, but these are, perhaps, neither the highest nor the most general. It would be premature to assume that the new church must be formed as were the denominations, with leaders, creed, ritual, etc. Why must the same procedure be followed in every detail? It would have to discard many familiar phrases and policies, but there would be others. The new church cannot arise out of the compromising of individuals; it must come from the new attitude of inclusiveness in them. After all, perhaps in the end the Christology of the new church will prove of more importance than its morphology.

The various parts of the church universal cannot be forced back into the sort of unity which was theirs before the Reformation. Time has gone on. It must be remembered, too, that to a large extent the best in denominationalism has produced the will to do away with denominationalism for a sufficiently great cause. We see the need for an opportunity to foster self-criticism, individual thought and effort. We see the need of recognizing as Christian people who follow Christ in quite a different way from ours. Christianity is involved in international thought. Its problems are international and supranational. It cannot be identified with one school of thought, one nation, or one race. A totally new conception of the church, of religion, and of life is needed. The new church cannot live by the rules which have governed the plenitude of denominations.

The new church must constantly be at work making its life congenial and fruitful to all its members. It must avoid that which limits, restricts, and inadequately expresses the spirit of the religion held by its varied types of members.

The new church must also be plastic, alert, and spiritually strong. Its thought and framework must be ready to yield to anything better.

Prof. Arthur Wilford Nagler of the Garrett Biblical Institute, in his splendidly organized book,[4] writes of the outbreak of the Reformation: "As we note the popular religious life of the times, several facts stand out clearly. An increased interest in personal religion, still too legalistic and too closely allied to the fear motive, but serious and genuine, was making itself felt. Some of this interest found expression in superstition and bigotry, in asceticism, sacred relics and pilgrimages; some of it was nobler in its outreach, less institutional and more mystical. It bespoke a yearning for spiritual satisfaction and a craving for something which the church seemingly failed to furnish." In all our thought of church unity we, too, must keep in mind the need of avoiding stagnant periods of corporate religious life. There must ever be something to meet the deeper needs of people, whatever their beliefs. The Church, moreover, must not be impatient with good and Christlike people who are living in accordance with the highest they know and yet cannot bring themselves into rationalized agreement with the church. The idea that the church has to contain only those who hold certain dogmas in common has always been pernicious. Certain people tended historically to emphasize certain beliefs, and thus became sectarian; we to-day can remain sectarian by emphasizing the fact that the Christian religion makes unity among individuals impossible.

---

[4] *The Church in History.*

In speaking of the decline of Protestantism after Catholicism rallied to the challenge of the Reformation, Professor Nagler writes: "The persistent and pernicious spirit of sectarianism divided forces that should have been united. The missionary spirit was smothered under an avalanche of doctrinal disputations. Negation and protest assumed too much importance to the neglect of positive constructive efforts. Excessive medievalism in doctrine was retained." History thus shows that a church resulting simply from boiling down doctrine and belief to the unity point will not be much of a church. It cannot be done that way, it seems. Dissension in belief seems co-existent with man's rational powers and temperamental predispositions.

Denominational history has invariably been ruined by the work of the followers of the organizing leaders. Sectarianism has always followed an unfortunate path in history. Great institutions in the same field cannot successfully rival each other. Denominations have never been able to maintain efficient relations with each other, especially in the face of social problems and general progress. They are conditioned by the historical situation which caused their birth.

Since the movement toward schism began with the council of Jerusalem A. D. 49, many councils and conferences have been held to bring together some sections of the church. Doctrines and beliefs have been worked over, usually with the result that the more discussion held sway, the more firmly fixed the schisms became.

In his remarkably complete and informing book,[5] Dr. Gaius Jackson Slosser of Western Theological Seminary stated that the Jesuits made early reunion with the Protestants impossible. So often it has happened that some subordinate society or group of individuals has been able to thwart movements of great potential significance. A crisis arises, leaders fail to cooperate, and then when the schism is transferred to the people, it is usually irremediable. I think that men like George Calixtus was right when he assigned the emphasis in Christianity to life, rather than doctrine, yet it would be difficult to conserve the best in systematic theology upon such a basis.

Divisions have occurred upon almost all of the distinguishing features of the Christian religion. But unity could not be achieved simply by removing these differences, if that were entirely possible. It will require a new spirit, a new means of ordering and aiming the religious life of an entire people.

Dr. Slosser's meaty paragraph on critical scholarship's contribution to Christian unity seems to me especially valuable (pp. 127-8): "In any effort to explain why, in modern times, union movements with official sanction have steadily increased in numbers and significance until to-day not a year passes without Christendom being thrilled by some outstanding combination of hitherto separated groups, we need to place the general progress of education throughout the world as a cause ranking next to, if not alongside, the missionary urge. We shall consider this progress in education as including: (1) The various significant contributions made toward the spiritualization and better understanding of the Scriptures by the spiritualization and better understanding of the Scriptures by the critical study of the same; (2) the increasing acceptance of philosophies, such as those of Von Hügel, Lloyd Morgan,

---

[5] *Christian Unity.*

General Smuts, Borden P. Bowne, Pringle-Pattison, Schleiermacher, Kant, and others, which form a favorable basis for a reunion in theology; (3) the progress made in the fields of religious and social psychology; (4) the vast extension of interdenominational religious education; (5) the increasing number of inter- or non-denominational colleges and universities together with union theological seminaries, and also the extended reading of interdenominational religious journals; (6) the larger numbers of students studying in the higher institutions of other lands and churches, together with the exchange of prefossors; (7) the greatly lessened amount of acrimoniousness and prejudice due to a fairly general study of comparative religions; (8) the very much perfected understanding that the churches have of each other as a result of conference and wider reading; (9) the enormously increased information peoples of all countries have about each other because of the improved facilities for travel, intercourse, printing, and schools; and (10) the inevitable disregarding or obliteration of sectarian walls in connection with the work of Christian unity societies, and the various Christian coöperative religious, moral, and social service organizations." But a great deal of individual and group effort has gone into the factors listed here.

Dr. Slosser's book should be carefully read by all who wish a keen, well-arranged analysis of the specific movements aimed toward church unity. The book orients one in the history of unity and acquaints one with the problems actually involved. No amount of pious hoping and rhetorical declamation can accomplish unity if we do not understand what situations we face and what unity would mean.

One notes that each council, by its decrees and conclusions, inevitably sowed the seeds of its own failure. The progressive revamping of creeds and dogmas cannot satisfy the needs of either a united or a divided church.

Denominations, moreover, at the time of their inception, did not realize the fact that they must ever compete with rivals; they could never be the *whole* church. Their periodic success would simply increase certain of their problems. A nation with a large number of churches, many of which claim to be the *true* church, is soon to see very drastic social and religious changes. The denomination, too, does not meet the spiritual needs of modern times. It is wasteful, weak, competitive, narrow, belligerent, exclusive.

The criticism is keenly made that such a new church would be too vague and loosely organized. This is a real danger, but we need not assume, however, that people disagreeing on doctrines and procedures could unite only in a weak and nebulous church. There is much more to be said and done. It is premature and extreme to say that such a church would have no principles and excite no faith. When the details have been worked out, both may be improved. As the individual comes to know the purpose and strength of the new church, he may find new principles to assure him, new goals to challenge him. The sense of universality, coöperation, and inclusiveness would eventually work changes in the whole religious life of the individual. To some the very fact that people so widely disagree and see so many different things in life is a great assurance of its richness and height. Nobody knows yet what strength the new church might develop when properly organized.

This new church, in many essential ways, would not be the historic church with which we are familiar. In the light of many aspects of its history, one could not regret the change. The church to-day has too many faults to be a leader in demanding the retention of the *status quo.* The best elements in the thought of the church would necessarily be retained. There will always be a need for different types of worship, for minds inherently mystical or puritanical or rational or ritualistic will always be with us. But we cannot return to the church of centuries ago; nor can we efficiently perpetuate the church exactly as it now is. The very strength, numbers, enthusiasm, *esprit de corps,* energy of thought and spiritual life would be assets of the new church.

Only superficial thinkers, however, think that the churches can or should be hastily reunited, over all kinds of objections and considerations. Church unity can and does become a fetish, an obsession, with some people. Church unity cannot by itself bring in the kingdom of God. It would deprive its value ultimately from the spiritual power of the individuals in its membership. We can raise serious objections to unity and to disunity. Plans for unity are still vague; plans for disunity have always been imperfect and inadequate. This situation should not perpetuate the idea that religious disagreement necessarily means institutional estrangement. Really genuine and sincere disagreement may be the beginning of better co-operation and virility of thought. It is ours to improve our own individual lives, benefit our fellow men and the institutions which serve us, and strive to discern and apply the best that new ideas and plans have to offer.

Church unity is yet afar off, and still vague in outline. But it is a glorious thought, and would be a consummation devoutly to be wished if it brought all men more fully and coöperatively into the service of Christ.

Richard K. Morton.

A PRAYER FOR TOLERANCE

Protestant or Catholic, God does not care
About the creed — it is the prayer,
To which He turns a kindly ear
And sends us peace to dry our tear.

We consider not the clothes we wear
When seeking solace in a prayer;
So why think God observes the creed?
He only sees our faith and need.

—*Sara Virginia Buckley.*

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

Bishop Manning's Protest and Other Letters

Bishop Manning Forbids Dr. Coffin, a Presbyterian, to Celebrate the Lord's Supper in St. George's Episcopal Church

DIOCESE OF NEW YORK

November 12, 1929.

TO THE RECTOR, CHURCH WARDENS AND VESTRYMEN OF ST. GEORGE'S CHURCH, NEW YORK.

Brethren:

I have learned only in the past few days that in connection with a meeting of an organization known as the Christian Unity League it is the purpose of your rector, the Rev. Dr. Reiland, and your purpose, to permit a communion service to be held in St. George's church at which the officiant is to be a minister who has not received episcopal ordination.

I received no previous intimation from you of this proposed service, and learned of it only from the published announcements [An invitation to the conference marked "Personal" was mailed to Bishop Manning a month or six weeks before the conference—Editor *The Christian Union Quarterly*] but since learning of it I have had conference in regard to it with your rector, and with you, and it is now my duty, as your bishop, to express to you clearly, but in all affection, my judgment in the matter, and I write the more freely because, as you know, the cause of Christian unity is one in which I have labored for many years.

In the discharge of my duty as bishop I am obliged to point out to you that the action which you are proposing to take would be a violation of your obligations as members, and officers, of the church to which you belong, and to request you, as I do hereby, not to take this action.

In the Episcopal church there are some things which we are permitted to do in the direction of unity, and there are other things which we are not permitted to do, and we who belong to this church must abide by her laws and principles.

The question is not what you, or I, may think about the doctrine of ministry, but what the church's doctrine is, and what our obligations are under the laws and canons of the church.

Every minister of the Protestant Episcopal church, before he can be ordained, makes in writing and signs his name to the following declaration and promise: "I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Protestant Episcopal church in the United States of America."

As to the question of the ministry, the *Book of Common Prayer,* by the regulations of which we are all of us bound, directs, in the preface to the ordinal, that no man shall be permitted to exercise the functions of the ministry in this church unless he "hath had episcopal consecration or ordination."

The canon of the church, enacted by our general convention, makes this law, laid down in the prayer book, a direct obligation upon church wardens and vestrymen, as well as upon the minister of every congregation, in the following words: "No minister in charge of any congregation of this church, or, in case of vacancy or absencce, no church wardens, vestrymen, or trustees of the congregation shall permit any person to officiate therein without sufficient evidence of his being duly licensed or ordained to minister in this church; provided, that nothing herein shall be so construed as to forbid communicants of the church to act as lay readers, or to prevent the bishop of any diocese or missionary district from giving permission to Christian men who are not ministers of this church to make addresses in the church on special occasions."

It is, I understand, your view that although you are forbidden both by the prayer book and the canon to hold in your church such a service as that above mentioned you have the right to loan your church to others and to permit them to hold therein this service which you are forbidden to hold yourselves.

The chancellor of the diocese, however, advises me that you have no such right. As a corporation created by the law of this state you are given the right to maintain worship of a prescribed kind, namely the worship of the Protestant Episcopal church and the chancellor has given me his opinion that as a matter of law it would be *ultra vires* and illegal for you to loan your church for a service such as that proposed.

In any case the loaning of your church for a communion service at which the officiant is to be a minister who has not received episcopal ordination would seem to be only a way of evading the law of the church and of doing by a less direct method that which the prayer book and the canon both expressly forbid; and therefore in the discharge of my duty as bishop, and for the sake of peace and unity in the church to which we belong, I must earnestly beg you, and I do hereby officially admonish you, not to carry out your plans for the above mentioned communion service at St. George's church and not to "permit any person to officiate therein without sufficient evidence of his being duly licensed or ordained to minister in this church."

In conclusion let me say a word as to the policy adopted by the Christian Unity League. As Sir Henry Lunn, a Methodist, and known the world over as an advocate of Christian unity, points out in his letter last Sunday in the New York *Times,* the announced policy of that organization is a strangely mistaken and a clearly disruptive one.

The members of the Christian Unity League will not aid the cause of unity by seeking to force their views on others and certainly not by trying to override and break down the laws of churches to which they belong. It would be neither a help toward unity nor an act of Christian courtesy, if we of like manner try to induce Roman Catholic priests to disobey the laws of their own church and take part with us in a united communion service. The cause of Christian unity will not be helped, but will rather be hindered, by action of this sort. The spirit of lawlessness and exaggerated individualism leads only to confusion, division, and disunion. We shall all of us make true advance toward unity by showing respect for the principles of those who differ from us and by loyalty to our own actual and present obligations.

As the announcement of this proposed service has been given wide publicity and in view of the deep concern which it has caused on the diocese, I am making this letter public.

Praying for God's blessing upon you and upon the congregation of St. George's church, I am,

Faithfully yours,
WILLIAM T. MANNING
Bishop of New York.

Dr. Coffin Offers Own Church

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
New York City

Nov. 12, 1929.

REV. CARL REILAND, D.D.,
St. George's Episcopal Church,
New York City.

My dear Dr. Reiland:

I am in receipt of your message that Bishop Manning has prohibited communion service in St. George's in connection with the New York conference of the Christian Unity League, at which I had been asked to officiate. I have accordingly telegraphed to Dr. Ainslie, offering him the chapel of the Union Theological Seminary for this service. It gives me great pleasure to invite you to take part in this service where ministers of all communions can freely share as brethren in the holy supper of our one Lord.

May I say that, of course, I should not have accepted the invitation of the conference had I not been assured by you that you and your vestry had thoroughly thought through your ecclesiastical right to offer the use of St. George's church to the conference for this service and had you not said that it was your and their wish that I should officiate.

The ministry of the church in which I serve has as unbroken a tradition, reaching back to the earliest age, as the ministry of any church in Christendom—if one cares to boast of these carnal things. I would not willingly expose this ministry to such disparagement as appears to be put upon it by Bishop Manning.

With sincere personal regards, believe me, cordially yours,

HENRY SLOANE COFFIN.

Dr. Reiland's Letter

TO THE NEW YORK CONFERENCE OF THE CHRISTIAN UNITY LEAGUE.

Brethren:

In behalf of the vestry of St. George's church, which granted the request of the Christian Unity League for the use of St. George's church for a non-Episcopal celebration of the Lord's supper on Friday evening, November 15, I am sorry to have to inform you that Bishop Manning has forbidden this service and accordingly with very deep regret we are compelled to withdraw the permission we gave for the celebration of the Lord's supper in our church building as the closing service of the conference.

We of St. George's are greatly disappointed, but we are not in despair. The authorities of this parish have no doubt of their ecclesiastical regularity and are convinced both of the correctness of their canonical position and the righteousness of their Christian purpose. We are actuated by no other aim than to promote "the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace."

Sincerely yours,
KARL REILAND.

For the rector, wardens, and vestry of St. George's church in the City of New York.
November 13, 1929.

Dr. Ainslie's Defense of the League

New York, Nov. 15, 1929.

RT. REV. WILLIAM T. MANNING,
New York.

My dear Bishop Manning:

In your letter under date of November 12, published in the New York *Times* and other papers, and which was addressed to the rector, church wardens and vestrymen of St. George's church, I deeply regret your unhappy references to the Christian Unity League which involves those of us outside of the Episcopal church who have been directing the affairs of the League and forwarding its purposes.

My cordial friendship and esteem for you through the years lead me to think you surely did not mean precisely what you said when you charged the league with seeking to force its views upon others and trying to override and break down the laws of various churches. This statement is erroneous and it is a matter of surprise that you should have allowed yourself to make it.

The league is composed of Christians holding membership in all Christian communions in America. There are as many Episcopalian members as there are members of any other communion. Included in the League membership are bishops of your church, who affirm their belief that all Christians are equal before God and that we, therefore, ought to conduct ourselves toward each other as brothers in Christ. I know of no instances among us of Episcopal league members forcing their views upon other Episcopalians who do not believe this, or of league members in other communions attempting to force their views upon members of their churches who do not believe this.

Your illustration of an attempt to force views upon a communion in which this league has no members is too absurd to be a matter of comment. We are not working from without; we are working from within. We are not interested in the uniformity of system among the churches. We are concerned with the "unity of the spirit" in Jesus Christ. Your policy, my dear bishop, is that of force and the letter; the league's policy is that of fellowship in the bonds of love.

When you charge that the Christian Unity League will not aid the cause of Christian unity by advocating the equality of all Christians before God, are we to understand that your policy will aid the cause of Christian unity when you forbid Dr. Henry S. Coffin, a Presbyterian minister, whose orders are as old and valid as your own, to celebrate the Lord's supper in a Christian unity conference held in an Episcopal church?

There is a large sentiment in all the churches for the unity of our Lord's followers, far beyond the official pronouncements of the churches. The Christian Unity League, composed of more than a thousand Christians who hold membership in various churches, has arisen as a result of this growing condition. There is also an increasing sentiment that Christian unity will never come to pass until it becomes the people's problem. In our membership are both the leaders and representatives of the masses, including some of the most outstanding ministers and laymen in America.

We have the same moral right to function in this field as the peace organizations of the world have for functioning for the abolition of war and for peace among nations independently of the heads of governments. These peace organizations, unofficial and belonging to the people, have been a powerful influence for the outlawry of war. Indeed, it has been said that the outlawry of war could not have come to pass without them.

The Christian Unity League, likewise unofficial and rising from the people, is functioning for the cause of a united Christendom by the principle that all Christians are equal before God, remembering that Jesus Christ said, "One is your teacher and you are all brothers."

We, of course, recognize that some Christians dissent from our position in this matter. But to us this position appears to be plainly and simply Christian. The Christian Unity League has taken this basic law of the body of Christ as the ground of its fellowship and work, and, in the spirit of Christian liberty, we are seeking to adjust our practices to it.

In view of your criticisms through the public print, I am giving this letter to the press.

Very sincerely,
PETER AINSLIE.

[From the New York *Times*.]

Statement of Dissent from Thirteen Episcopal Rectors

The undersigned ministers of the Protestant Episcopal church in attendance at the New York conference of the Christian Unity League hereby express their regret and mortification at the action of the bishop of New York in forbidding the rector and vestry of St. George's church to allow the conference to celebrate the Lord's supper in their edifice because the minister who was to officiate was not episcopally ordained. Such action on the part of a bishop of the Episcopal church deprives our church's overture toward unity of all meaning, if it is acquiesced in by the church.

It is not in accord with a sane and liberal interpretation of the canon which restricts such "officiating" in a "congregation" of this church and says nothing in our judgment about officiating in the edifice. And this is the traditional interpretation of the canon. All over the country, in emergencies, rectors and vestries have lent their edifices to non-Episcopal ministers for worship and sacramental rites.

The rector and vestry are the legal owners of the property and the action of the bishop is, in our opinion, a usurpation of authority under the guise of interpreting the canon. The rector and vestry had decided that they possessed the right to lend the building for such an occasion and purpose as this conference, by both civil and canonical law. The only authority competent to deny their interpretation was the courts. We understand that the rector and vestry waived their right for the present because the controversy was unpleasant to the officers of the conference.

We hope, however, that they will not let the matter rest here, but will secure some weighty legal opinion confuting the bishop's claims. Concessions out of courtesy to authority are full of danger to constitutional government. Exacted courtesies, if granted, become tyrannies. We cannot forget that it was by steadfast resistance to such episcopal interpretations and claims that the constitutional liberty of our church was secured and maintained.

It is in the interest both of the Episcopal church's canon law, which is liberal upon this point, and of the cause of Christian unity, that we feel it our duty to declare that the bishop of New York has not construed the law in the spirit of our discipline. He has shown a narrowness of interpretation in regard to the canon that is hurtful to the church's best interest and most inconsistent in a bishop who is so indulgent of the reservation of the sacrament, in spite of the church's express prohibition of such a practice. This one-sidedness of discipline must deprive his ruling in this case of any weight with impartial people.

If the proposed service had gone on, no law would have been broken, but an ancient custom would have been made fruitful in good-will. In the interest of Christian fellowship and of the Protestant Episcopal church we express our conviction that this ruling is an infringement of the rights of the vestry and an injury to Christian unity. It should be resisted and disavowed.

Carl F. Grammer, Rector of St. Stephen's church, Philadelphia, Pa.

Robert Norwood, Rector of St. Bartholomew's church, New York.

Beverley D. Tucker, J8., Rector of St. Paul's church, Richmond, Va.

Thomas F. Opie, Rector, church of the Holy Comforter, Burlington, N. C.

Wilbur L. Caswell, Rector, St. Paul's church, Yonkers, N. Y.

Guy Emery Shipler, Editor, *The Churchman*.

Clifford Gray Twombly, Rector of St. James' church, Lancaster, Pa.

Walton Hall Doggett, Rector of St. John's church, Framingham Centre, Mass.

J. Howard Melish, Rector of Holy Trinity church, Brooklyn.

Charles Malcolm Douglas, Rector of Christ church, Short Hills, N. J.

Luke M. White, St. Luke's church, Montclair, N. J.

Robert Rogers, Rector of the church of the Good Shepherd, Brooklyn, N. Y.

John Lowry Hady, Rector of Gloria Dei church, Philadelphia, Pa.

Bishop Manning Usurped Authority in the Opinion of Dr. Grammer of St. Stephen's Church

There can be but little difference of opinion among broad-minded people in regard to the inhibition by Bishop Manning of the loan of St. George's church to the Christian Unity League for a communion service because a non-Episcopal minister was to celebrate the Lord's supper. The incident was decidedly unfortunate. Its repercussion among our Protestant brethren is that now at last they know how their rites are looked upon by an Episcopal bishop who claims to be an ardent advocate of church unity; the Lord's supper as celebrated by them is, in his opinion, a desecration of our church building. He is not opposed to the loan of the building for a conference in which there is prayer, teaching, and hymn singing. But let one of their number celebrate the Lord's supper, and the building has been desecrated. In the bishop's judgment, the lack of Episcopal ordination in the minister makes the Lord's supper an unhallowed rite.

How preposterous are overtures toward church unity from a bishop with such feelings. I have always contended that our church did not have the right people in charge of our relations to the Protestant world. The good to be brought out of this evil is that the naked reality is disclosed behind Bishop Manning's cloak of appreciation of our Protestant brothers. In spite of his specious words about the cathedral as a symbol of Christian fellowship, he is the same Manning who, as a presbyter, opposed the Panama conference. His real aim is absorption and not association. Their most sacred rite is in his eyes a desecration.

The question, however, remains whether the bishop was not within his canonical rights in issuing this mandate. Many people, misled by analogies from military command, or by usages in other Episcopal churches, are of that opinion. Yet the protest of the Episcopal members of the Christian Unity League denied that the bishop had this authority. The public is entitled to an examination of this position. What is wanted is not a pronunciamento, but a reasoned explanation. It is a pity that the chancellor of the diocese of New York has not given this. Surely his ground will be something stronger than the bishop's argument that the 23rd canon forbids such a use of the building. The title of this canon runs, "Of persons not ministers in this Church officiating in any congregation thereof—" . . The marginal summary reads, "No person to minister in this Church unless duly authorized." Note the capital "C" in church, which clearly indicates that the organization and not the edifice is meant. The language of the canon is clear. "No minister in charge of any congregation of this Church or in case of vacancy or absence no church wardens, vestrymen or trustees of the congregation shall permit any person to officiate therein without sufficient evidence of his being duly licensed or ordained to minister in this Church." (The rest of the canon refers to special cases and is not pertinent.) The proposed Lord's supper would not have been celebrated in a congregation of this Church, but in a congregation of the Christian Unity League. The canon therefore does not apply.

But, it may be asked, has not a bishop a general supervision that justifies him in overruling the action of the rector and vestry in lending the building? For aught I know this may be true of a Roman Catholic bishop or of an English bishop. But the case is different with regard to a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal church. It is a great pity that so many of the English and Canadian clergy never fully grasp the unique features in the constitution and canons of our church. The organizers of the Protestant Episcopal church were men in love with freedom and constitutional government. They required of our bishops, before they receive episcopal consecration, the promise of "conformity and obedience to the doctrine, discipline and worship of the Protestant Episcopal church." Whatever might be the bishop's views of the source of his authority, it was to be exercised according to our constitution and canons which constitute our discipline.

Now, nowhere do the canons give the bishop any authority over the church building. Canon 23, sec. ii, gives the rector the use and control of church and parish buildings. This is a discretion which is not subjected to the bishop's overruling, just as the bishop has no power of overruling a rector in regard to his discretion about presenting people for confirmation or administering baptism. All these belong to a realm where the church commits the subject matter to the rector's judgment. His decision is final and subject to no reversal. This is, I believe, the general rule about powers of discretion. They can only be overruled where the discretion is exercised with manifest injury to the purposes of the organization, or the public weal.

The handling of church property is clearly such a case. The law of the land is opposed to ownership of real estate by a church and requires that the title shall be held by a corporation in which laymen predominate. The only restriction on their use is that they shall be governed in its use by the laws of the church. Our bishops have agreed to govern according to law. The law of the church is laid down in the 21st canon, "For the purposes of his office and for the full and free discharge of all functions and duties pertaining thereto, the rector shall, at all times, be entitled to the use and control of the church and parish buildings." Who is to decide "what is necessary for the full and free discharge" of his "duties and functions" except the rector himself? If he is of the opinion that the loan of his building to a group of admirable Christians of high standing for a sacred rite is a help toward discharging his solemnly acknowledged duty of "maintaining and setting forward . . . . . quietness, peace and love among all Christian people," who has the right to forbid him?

It is true he promised obedience to "godly admonitions and godly judgment of his bishop." But if the church is to have a government by law and all its machinery of limited rights and assigned duties as laid down in the canons is to be made effective, great stress must be placed on the adjective "godly." For the minister is also pledged to "maintain the discipline as this Church has received the same"; "to drive away doctrines contrary to God's word"; to "set forward peace and love among Christian people." Surely this admonition of the bishop's, requiring the rector and vestry to recall an invitation that they had given in full confidence that they were within their rights, is not according to the discipline of our church, which gave him no such appellate authority, is based on a doctrine of values that places the ritual and legal above the spiritual and moral in a manner "contrary to God's word"; and is prolific of ill-will and hard feeling rather than of "peace and love." Who can call such an admonition godly? It cannot be required of the members of the Episcopal church who value episcopacy as an ancient mode of church government, but do not believe in its *divine right* to rule that they should accept or acquiesce in claims which substitute a government by Episcopal opinion for a government by law. They believe that the closest analogy to the relation of a bishop to a rector is not that of a colonel to a captain, but that of the president of the United States to a governor, or of a governor to a mayor. The one higher than the other, and, in an important sense, over the other; but the lower having his own special sphere into which the higher cannot intrude.

There is no need to raise the question of the authority of the vestry. It is manifest that the vestry as a corporation is responsible to the state, and must be satisfied that the rector is using the building in obedience to the canons. But that question does not enter; for the vestry of St. George's, containing eminent lawyers, agreed with the rector that the loan was not against any law, civil or canonical. Many will regret that they yielded the point, but we make no criticism. The situation was complicated by the message of the president of the Christian Unity League suggesting that the courtesy be abandoned. That course may have been most conducive to the interests of the League; it certainly was not conducive of the best interests of the Protestant Episcopal church. After this episode, who could be surprised if the non-Episcopal churches paid less and less heed to the overtures of the Episcopal church, especially those from a commission in which Bishop Manning has a seat. If an Episcopal rector and vestry can be overruled so arbitrarily, who can hope that our ministry will attract men who value freedom? Who can think that any man, bishop or not, has a divine right to sow ill-feeling in this fashion?

On these grounds we hold that the Episcopal ministers at the conference were justified in asserting that this mandate of Bishop Manning's was a "usurpation of authority under the guise of an interpretation of a canon," which "ought to be resisted and disavowed."

[From Rev. Carl E. Grammer, Rector St. Stephen's Episcopal Church, Philadelphia, Pa., in *The Churchman,* New York.]

Sir Henry Lunn's Letter to the New York Times and Dr. Ainslie's Reply

Sir Henry Lunn's Letter

To the Editor of The New York Times:

The Christian Union Quarterly for October, edited by my large-hearted and liberal-minded friend, Dr. Peter Ainslie of Baltimore, has just arrived on this side of the Atlantic. In it I find an announcement by the Christian Unity League stating that a conference will be held in St. George's church, New York City, Nov. 13-15, with the especial object of asserting that: "No Christian shall be denied membership in our churches, nor a place in our celebration of the Lord's supper, nor pulpit courtesies be denied other ministers, because they belong to a different denomination than our own."

I am in entire sympathy with the object defined in this resolution, but I venture to remind those who have called this conference, with the main object of propagating this policy, that the reforms must come from within those churches which at present raise barriers that this conference would like to break down.

I am writing this letter from a famous club founded by John Bright, Richard Cobden and the other British leaders of the free trade movement. The condition for membership is that every man shall be a "reformer." The next club in Pall Mall, our street of clubs, is the Carlton, of which it is a rigid rule that every member shall be a Conservative.

It would be scarcely reasonable to call an assembly of the Reform club, entirely composed of men and women in favor of reform, to move a resolution that the Carlton club should open its doors to all of us and give us all the privileges of membership.

Another club to which I belong has had in its constitution since its formation a rule that every member must be a graduate of a university. We should not consider it justifiable if those who had been educated in the public schools and had not gone further were to hold a meeting insisting upon this club altering its rules. Recently an alteration has been made from within that members of the army, navy and air services who have not been to the university should be admitted.

In the Episcopal communion after the last Lambeth conference a great change took place. The bishops in that assembly laid it down that no priest of the Anglican church should repel from communion any one who presented himself. They also opened the pulpit of Anglican churches all round the world, under certain limited conditions, to those who were advocating Christian unity.

The situation has been revolutionized by these decisions of the Lambeth conference. In the years before the Lambeth conference so distinguished a man as the dean of Ripon, offering to preach in the City Temple, of which the minister was then Joseph Parker, who was at one time asked to succeed Henry Ward Beecher, accepted the inhibition of the bishop of London and did not preach. He told me this story himself with great regret because he much desired to preach in this pulpit.

Since this decision of the Lambeth conference it has been the custom, to take only one illustration, for the president of the Wesleyan conference and the bishop of the diocese to exchange pulpits in the town in which the Wesleyan Methodist conference is held, and it is an incident that attracts no particular attention when the bishop of the diocese preaches in one of the leading chapels or the leading ministers preach in the cathedral or other churches. This has come about not as the result of an attack upon the church but as the result of friendly conferences between the bishops and the representatives of the Free churches of the Lambeth continuation committee.

After all, as Galileo said long ago, the world does alter. Sixty-odd years ago, when I began to be interested in these questions, it was the custom in our little town for the Methodist minister in the chapel I attended to announce that admission to the holy communion would be by the society ticket, but that others who wished to attend could interview him in vestry and receive a ticket. Just before the war I was visiting Banff, a town in the North of Scotland, and went to a Presbyterian church. It was my intention to remain to the communion service, but I was asked to withdraw and go up into the gallery, that I might join the children in looking down, while the elect members of the Presbyterian church in that town had their communion service.

I believe that in Presbyterianism this exclusion has disappeared. It has certainly disappeared in Methodism, and all the non-Episcopal churches of this country welcome each other to communion. What the Germans call the "age spirit" is powerful and if we will have patience those barriers will be broken down, which will only be strengthened by those within the fortifications if we attack them. I therefore urge my friends, many of whom are responsible for this gathering at St. George's church, to consider whether it is not better to drop these items from their program and to concentrate upon the spread of a catholic spirit in their own churches, assured that the infection will ultimately reach those without.

HENRY S. LUNN,
Editor, *Review of the Churches.*

London, Oct. 29, 1929.

Dr. Ainslie's Reply

To the Editor of The New York Times:

I read with interest the letter of my friend and co-worker Sir Henry Lunn in *The Times,* and I delight in his great magazine, *The Review of the Churches,* but he misses the whole point of the New York Christian Unity Conference at St. George's Episcopal church in New York.

It is not a group of Presbyterians trying to change the Episcopal church; nor a group of Methodists trying to change the Baptist church, such as Sir Henry cites of the Reform club on Pall Mall trying to change the policy of the Carlton club. Were that so, it would be unwise and profitless. Instead, it is similar to a meeting of individuals of the Reform and Carlton clubs to discuss better relations between the two groups, which is perfectly proper.

The very instance that Sir Henry cites, the breaking down of barriers between churches, has brought many of us of various churches, especially those churches that have barriers, to the point that we practice equality of all Christians before God as a paramount issue of these times, as a contribution to the unity of Christendom. To that end we Christians of various churches lately started the Christian Unity League around a pact which emphasizes the equality of all Christians before God.

The Christian Unity League is the culmination of that adventurous work spoken of by Sir Henry, which has been going on within the churches for years, and we of the various churches are working within our churches for its larger expression.

As, for instance, I am a member of the Disciples, which is a denomination with more than 1,000,000 members who practice closed membership, that is, they receive into their churches only those persons who have been baptized by immersion. Some years ago, along with those who had preceded me in their thinking, we came to the conclusion that no church had a moral right to close its doors to other Christians on the technical form of baptism or any other form, so now there are about 100 churches among the Disciples that practice open membership, that is, receive other Christians into full membership irrespective of the form of their baptism. There are even more churches among the Baptists that do this, Dr. Fosdick's church being among them.

Among the Episcopalians there are outstanding leaders, like Dr. Beverly D. Tucker, Jr., of St. Paul's, Richmond, Va.; Dr. Karl Reiland of St. George's, New York; Dr. Robert Norwood of St. Bartholomew's, New York; Dr. J. H. Melish of Holy Trinity, Brooklyn; and Dr. Guy Emery Shipler, editor of *The Churchman,* and others, who favor such an expression of equality of all Christians before God as will enable Christians to have the right of free entry to the Episcopal church, with full communion privileges, as was recently expressed by the dean of Canterbury.

Why Sir Henry, a Methodist, dissents from these free souls meeting together to discuss this problem of equality of all Christians before God and seeking to establish better relations in this wider fellowship, is a surprising turn of a mind that is so habitually cordial to all those things that make for understanding and fellowship in the churches.

PETER AINSLIE.

[From the New York *Times.*]

One More Handicap to Church Unity

It is a matter of great regret that a conference on the subject of church unity, which met in New York at the call of the Christian Unity League, seems rather to have been so conducted as to impede the coming of unity to the church than to have promoted it.

There is an interesting legal and canonical question involved in the loaning of a church. Apart from the sworn obligation of a priest to obey the "discipline" of this church, a like obligation is given at the consecration of a church that it will be administered according to the "doctrine, discipline, and worship" of this church, while also the statute law of every state of which we have knowledge lays upon the vestry or trustees of an Episcopal parish the obligation to obey the canon law of the church. Thus the obligation to obey that law rests not merely on the honor of rectors and vestrymen — though that is generally sufficient — but also on statute law, according to which disobedient trustees or vestrymen could almost certainly be removed by civil process in order to preserve a trust, which latter is an obligation in civil rather than in ecclesiastical law. White, in his monumental work, *American Church Law* (edition 1911), declares that a vestry "cannot divert such property to any other purpose than the maintenance of the church's worship and the propagation of her doctrines as defined and set forth in her *Book of Common Prayer,* nor sever their connection with the church and unite with any other religious body without impairing their title to the property of the parish by them holden in trust therefor.—(*Jones* v. *Wadsworth,* 11 *Phila.* Rep., 227; *Isham* v. *Trustees, etc.,* 63 *How. Pr.,* 465; *Watson* v. *Jones,* 13 *Wall.,* 679.)"—p. 160.

It is true that there have been instances of loaning a church to some other religious body for its services, under special conditions. Dr. Reiland cites, for instance, the use of the Cathedral church of New York for services of the Russian Orthodox church, by permission of Bishop Manning. This, however, is to be interpreted, not as an unconditional loan of the edifice, but rather as the episcopal license to Russian Orthodox ministers to conduct a special service, approved by the bishop, being their own national rite; those ministers having "episcopal ordination," and so conforming to the condition stated in the preface to the ordinal, and being eligible for the bishop's license. We have in mind also the occasional emergency granting of our churches for use when the church of another Christian body has burned or been subjected to some similar casualty. In such cases very likely the letter of the law of church and state has been violated, but, it may be said, by unanimous consent of all concerned, and one can scarcely visualize an attempt to penalize church authorities for such a purely emergency and technical violation of law. This editor recalls, for instance, the tender of the use of the Cathedral church of the diocese of Milwaukee by a former bishop to a neighboring Presbyterian congregation in distress by the burning of their church building. The offer was not accepted, but the fact of its being offered is, truly, a case in point. Undoubtedly that offer was not justified by formal law and is only to be defended as an emergency measure.

But more serious than this, in our judgment, is the pretense of a rector or of a vestry to the right to determine a case of this sort without the judgment of the bishop. When the rector of St. George's, by any sort of reasoning, deemed it useful to invite a Presbyterian minister to celebrate holy communion in his church, well knowing that his bishop would probably disapprove, and that his own sole right to deliver the invitation was at least open to question, it appears to us that he offered an indignity to that minister, who would naturally assume that the priest was within his legal rights in giving the invitation, and Dr. Coffin's letter clearly indicates that he felt the same. Moreover, Sir Henry Lunn's "protest" against forcing from without a change in the official policy of any church as being in any sense a step toward unity, shows that Dr. Ainslie and Dr. Reiland, in adopting this policy of force, cannot speak for Protestants generally, or assume that this attempt to break down the law of the Episcopal church has the sanction of the great mass of Christian people. Indeed we cannot escape from the conclusion that the (New York) *Herald-Tribune* was right in saying that "the liberal party, or 'loose constructionists,' of the Episcopal church have watched this incident with the greatest interest, because they felt that, if Dr. Coffin acted as announced, a precedent would have been set and the doors of the Episcopal church would be opened wide to ministers of other Christian denominations." We do not, however, believe that many "liberals" in the church at large would sanction this position. Bishop Manning was bound to meet the issue when it was raised and he did so nobly.

We have honored Dr. Ainslie for his leadership toward that end, but we cannot feel that in his latest policies he is doing justice to himself or to the cause that has for so long been his chief interest. And for those of our own clergy who are willing to repudiate the position of the church of the ages in so vital a manner, we can only hope that the outcome of this unhappy incident will be a warning to them; while we trust that Protestant ministers in general will be on their guard so that they may not be placed in a compromising position by accepting any invitations from clergymen who may in future tender invitations to them that they are not in position to fulfil without breaking completely with their ecclesiastical superiors.

[From *The Living Church,* Milwaukee, Wis.]

Freedom Under Law

The bishop of New York requested the rector and vestry of St. George's church to withdraw the invitation which they gave to the Christian Unity League to hold a service of the holy communion at the conclusion of its meetings in St. George's. In so acting the bishop was within his canonical rights, one of which is to give godly advice and counsel. It is, however, the right of the rector and vestry to decide whether or not the advice and counsel are godly.

In stating his position the bishop recognized that St. George's church was loaned to the league for a series of meetings in the interest of church unity, and that the league chose to have a service of the holy communion and invited a Presbyterian minister to act as the celebrant. It is a distinction to be kept clearly in mind in the discussion of the issue. St. George's did not invite a minister, not of the Episcopal church, to celebrate the communion. Nor was the service to be the Lord's supper according to the office of the holy communion in the *Book of Common Prayer*. The Lord's supper was to be celebrated after the manner in which the celebrant was accustomed to celebrate it. Moreover, the consent of the bishop was not requested, and under the canon no such power of consent is vested in the bishop. The authorities of St. George's granted the use of their church building to Christian men for a Christian purpose.

The bishop has raised the question of their legal right so to do and has referred to two laws, one from the canons and the other from the prayer book.

The canon, as interpreted by the chancellor of the diocese of New York, writes the bishop, gives a corporation such as St. George's church the right to maintain worship only according to the Protestant Episcopal church, and that it is *ultra vires* and illegal to loan the church for any other kind of worship. This is the opinion of the chancellor of the diocese of New York, a lawyer of no mean ability. In this connection, however, it will be recalled that the same chancellor, a few months ago, advised Bishop Manning that he could loan the cathedral of St. John the Divine to the Greek archbishop for a service of worship according to the rites of the Holy Orthodox church; and the cathedral was so used. It is well to recall, also, that the rector and vestry of Trinity church, Boston, loaned their church to the Unitarians for the funeral of a former governor of Massachusetts, and that the service of worship was according to the usage of that communion; and that St. Bartholomew's church, New York, under Dr. Leighton Parks, was repeatedly loaned for weddings, celebrated by rites other than the office of holy matrimony found in the prayer book.

It is a matter of common practice, even as it is one of Christian courtesy, to extend the use of an Episcopal church to the people of another church when their building has been made untenable; and the services which have been held Sunday after Sunday, sometimes for a period of months, have been those of worship according to their own rites and in no sense such as the Episcopal church has prescribed. In the history of Trinity church, New York, of which Bishop Manning was formerly rector, a notable case of such use of the church is found. Following the Revolution, Dr. Samuel Proovoost, rector of Trinity church and later bishop of New York, offered St. Paul's chapel and St. George's chapel to Dr. John Rodgers, pastor of the First Presbyterian church, whose building had been desecrated by British troops. During the period of restoration the Presbyterian church conducted worship in these buildings after the order of their own communion. A famous precedent is the use to which Canterbury cathedral was put at the Reformation, which is continued to this day. The Calvinists, that is men of Presbyterian ordination, hold their services according to their own rites in that great fane.

If St. George's representatives did an illegal thing in offering their church for this service, so the bishop of New York and all these rectors and vestrymen have done the same illegal thing.

The bishop also attempted to support his judgment by reference to the preface to the ordinal, where it is stated that "No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon in this church, or suffered to execute any of said functions, except he hath had episcopal consecration or ordination." The ordinal prescribes the method by which ministers shall be set apart for the Episcopal church. If St. George's were choosing a man to serve their parish this citation would be applicable and binding. But they were not attempting any such thing; the congregation in attendance on the conference of the Christian Unity League was not in any sense of the word a "congregation of this church," even as the service was not an office of this church. Nor was the service one of those special occasions when a Christian man, not a minister of this church, is, with the bishop's consent, asked to make an address. There is no law in ordinal or canons that applies to this situation. In the absence of all law it is fair to assume that the rector and vestry may use the "liberty wherewith Christ doth make them free."

If such be a fair statement of the law and the facts in this case, we are forced to the conclusion that the bishop of New York, in giving his official admonition to St. George's, has committed a grievous error of judgment. He has used laws which are open to different interpretations to enforce a partisan position; he has not represented the comprehensiveness of the Episcopal church. And in enforcing a partisan position, which he as an individual is entitled to hold, he has as a bishop done an irreparable injury to the cause of Christian unity. He says that he has himself worked for church unity. So he has, but now that great cause has been injured in the house of its friends. Christian statesmanship would have led the bishop to take no notice of St. George's, and to accord to the members of that splendid parish the liberty which is theirs under the law of the Episcopal church.

On receiving Bishop Manning's official admonition, the rector and vestry of St. George's church, while protesting their legal right to do what they had done, withdrew the permission which they had granted to the Christian Unity League to hold the Lord's supper in St. George's. In our opinion this was a mistake of judgment. Having put their hand to the plow they should not have turned back. It would have been better for the cause of Christian unity for them never to have entered upon this course, rather than, having entered, to revoke a permission which was within their rights to grant. The Episcopal church is the freest church in Christendom, as Phillips Brooks once said; but if rectors and vestries will not make use of their freedom there can be no progress. To claim the right that is ours under the law, in the face of official admonition, may open us to the charge of lawlessness; but in reality it is our duty and the way to maintain our liberty.

In the cause of Christian unity Christ is either present or absent. If he is present, if good-will and the fellowship of all who love him are according to his mind and heart, how shall he be served? There is but one answer — as he served. He was charged with breaking the law of the church, and the state claimed power over him. In answer he declared that the state had no power over him, and that he served not the high priest, the church or tradition; he was a servant of the truth. "For this was I born and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness to the truth."

[From *The Churchman,* New York.]

A Graceless Bishop

With the purely ecclesiastical aspect of the action of Bishop Manning, of New York, in forbidding the holding of a communion service in connection with the conference of the Christian Unity League in St. George's church, at which President Henry Sloane Coffin was to officiate, *The Congregationalist* has little concern. The interpretation of the laws and ordinances of the Episcopal church, and their application to specific circumstances is not our business. In general, it would seem that in the anomalous situation that confronts historic and closely constituted organizations, ecclesiastical and other, in a world of growing ideas and of newer manifestations and enrichments of the spirit of grace and goodness, certain broad and liberal principles might be applied with wisdom and without any inherent dishonesty or betrayal of a trust. It is such principles that, rightly or wrongly, by almost universal consent and custom, have become established both in the church of England and in the Protestant Episcopal church with respect to subscription to historic creeds. Wide latitude of individual interpretation is commonly practiced, and while the stiff letter of laws and ordinances may not be capable of the same latitude of interpretation, there are forms of strict literalism and legalism and of administrative scrupulousness that do not make in actuality either for essential honesty or high-mindedness.

To an outsider three possible courses would have seemed open to Bishop Manning in the difficult situation with which, considering his view of the matter, he was confronted. He might have given more reasonable heed to the claim of those who, recognizing the ordinances, thought of the communion service planned for this special gathering not as an Episcopal service but as a service of another and larger significance for which St. George's church was loaned by its own vestry. A bishop of broad mind, even if he held the view of the matter which Bishop Manning has expressed, might in recognition of the extreme conflict of opinion have regarded the special circumstances and the views of Episcopal associates who differed from him and withheld his ban without what would seem a serious compromise with either high ideals or conscientious duty. If, however, this duty of making his own position clear seemed imperative, it might still have been possible for Bishop Manning to have made a public statement indicating his viewpoint, but putting responsibility for the matter upon St. George's church. And in the third place, if the bishop felt it his bounden Episcopal duty to go the full length of restraining St. George's rector and vestry by forbidding the holding of the service, that action, even drastic in its nature and liable to be misunderstood, might have been taken in a gracious and magnanimous spirit—the spirit of a man faced with stern necessity and duty, but putting all the emphasis upon the necessity and showing some appreciation of the inherent and non-legal aspect of the situation.

As facts stand, a document more graceless than that in which Bishop Manning banned Dr. Coffin's participation in the communion service could hardly be conceived. The officious ecclesiastic is far more in evidence in its letter and spirit than the man acting with grace and dignity from a high sense of duty. Regardless of one's own opinions, one could respect a man so acting; but what might have been a dignified statement becomes in Bishop Manning's utterance little short of a diatribe. Bishop Manning could write in entirely different vein when, not so long ago, he was soliciting the support of non-Episcopalians for the project of completing the cathedral of St. John the Divine.

The purely Episcopal aspect of Bishop Manning's action is, we repeat, not our affair; but where the matter enters the area of the discussion of Christian unity it *is* our affair. When Bishop Manning, having set forth the ground of his ban, proceeds to criticize the Christian Unity League and to defend his course on the ground of his superior concern for Christian unity, he comes near the borderline of insult and hypocrisy. Clear-seeing, plain-spoken Christians (no matter how much they might respect a bishop painfully doing his duty) can see neither glory, nor goodness in the action of one eminent leader in the Christian church excluding another eminent leader from officiating at a communion service for those of various denominations, gathered in behalf of unity. The sooner laws and ordinances affecting such an incident are changed in accordance with the spirit of Christ—who apparently, like Dr. Coffin, was never episcopally ordained—the better it will be for the church and for the world.

[From *The Congregationalist,* Boston.]

A Courageous Bishop

We wonder whether the rector of St. George's, New York, imagined he was doing something to promote unity, when he undertook to "lend" the church for a communion service to be conducted by a Presbyterian minister. A suspicious person might be tempted to doubt it, or even to say that he was attempting to do indirectly what he knew could not be done directly, and so to win a cheap triumph.

Bishop Manning deserves great credit for the promptness and firmness of his action. He had to decide whether he should allow the church to be put in a false position, or, on the other hand, offend the rector and vestry of a great parish, and offer what must seem a discourtesy to the respected president of Union Seminary. A weak man might well have hesitated. He acted nominally on the ground of a strict interpretation of a canon, and consequently has been reproached for having put legalism above charity. His critics choose to overlook the fact that back of the canon lies a principle which is fundamental to the Prayer Book, the ordinal, and the constitution of the church. It was this principle, not a mere technicality, that he was really concerned to defend. All loyal churchmen will thank him.

[From *The American Church Monthly,* New York.]

Christian Unity Idealism Now on Bedrock

We, Christians of various churches, believing that only in a coöperative and united Christendom can the world be Christianized, deplore a divided Christendom as being opposed to the Spirit of Christ and the needs of the world. We desire to express our sympathetic interest in and prayerful attitude toward all conferences, small and large, that look toward the reconciliation of the divided church of Christ.

We acknowledge the equality of all Christians before God and propose to practice this principle as far as possible in all our spiritual fellowships. We will strive to bring the laws and practices of our several communions into conformity with this principle, so that no Christian shall be denied membership in any of our churches, or the privilege of participation in the observance of the Lord's supper, and that the competence of Christian ministers of communions other than our own to exercise the functions of a fully Christian and valid ministry shall not be denied by reason of differences in forms of ordination.* Irrespective of denominational distinctions, we pledge to be brethren one to another in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour, whose we are and whom we serve.

Above is the text of the pact of Christian unity, adopted on November 15, by the New York conference of the Christian

---

* The clause from the word "competence" to this point is a revised form of the language adopted by the conference, an ambiguity having been detected in the earlier form. The wording as given here is believed to express the intention of the conference, but has not yet received official approval.

Unity League and authorized as the basis upon which the league proposes to extend its present list of more than a thousand members until it includes a fellowship of tens of thousands in all denominations of the Christian world. The conference, held in St. George's Protestant Episcopal church, was a gathering of individual Christians who spoke for no one but themselves, represented no denominational organizations and sought only to define for their own minds the problem of Christian unity and to find the way out of our sectarian confusion. So completely was the gathering dissociated from all implications of a representative character that the printed program gave no indication of the denominational connection of any speaker, and when he was presented for his address the name of his denomination was not mentioned.

This was something definitely new in the Christian unity movement. It was an attempt to free the movement from the cumbersome method of trying to unite denominations that are not ready to unite. This method has been unfruitful because it always involved a threshing over of old theological and historical straw, and kept the essential problem from emerging to the light. The essential and primary problem of Christian unity is not the problem of "faith and order." It is neither theological nor ecclesiastical. It is a problem in Christian morality. The solution of the problem will not be found in a common creed or a common polity, but in a common ethic — an ethic which reflects the mind of Christ and which will, therefore, cause the reëxamination of our churchly practices to discover whether these practices are unbrotherly and unchristian and, therefore, contrary to the mind of Christ. We shall make progress toward a united Christendom only when we cease to consider our doctrines and our orders in terms of their origin and their "proofs," and examine the moral quality of the practices which they lead us to adopt. If under cover of our doctrines and orders we find ourselves doing things which are plainly unchristian there will be no course open to us but to revise our practices at whatever cost to our doctrines and orders.

It was this ethical point of view which distinguished the New York conference. A formula designed to lay bare the moral implications of our sectarian practices was the basis of membership in the conference. Each participant had signed the above pact which defines as the central principle of Christian unity the fact that all Christians are equal before God. Any practice by a Christian church which presupposes the in-equality of Christians before God stands condemned as unchristian. And if all Christians are equal before God all Christian churches are equal before God. Any ecclesiastical practice, therefore, based upon the assumption of the superiority of a particular church before God stands condemned as unchristian. It violates the thought and will of God. It usurps an authority which belongs to him alone. If God accepts and approves and blesses a Christian, a church, or a ministry, who are we that we should presume to reject such a Christian, such a church, such a ministry? To do so is the essence of schism. It is a violation of the basic law of the organic body of Christ. It is nothing less than sin.

The conference opened in an acute experience of the way in which this sectarian presumption operates. The rector of St. George's church, Dr. Karl Reiland, supported by his entire vestry, had arranged with the Christian Unity League for a celebration of the Lord's supper as the concluding act of the conference. Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, president of Union Theological seminary, a Presbyterian clergyman, was to be the celebrant. On the day before the conference opened, Bishop Manning issued a prohibition against the observance of the Lord's supper on the ground that according to canon law only an episcopally ordained clergyman could administer communion in an Episcopal church.

This act of the bishop of New York registered deep in the consciousness of the members of the conference. Repeated allusions to it as an unfortunate episode in connection with a Christian unity gathering were made, at first in veiled terms but in later sessions with outspoken candor. Upon maturer reflection it seemed on the whole to be no misfortune, since it stripped and laid bare by a concrete and specific illustration the essential immorality of sectarianism. It was an unbrotherly act. It was an unchristian act. It was a schismatic, a divisive act. It violated the fundamental law of Christian unity. As such, however, it gave point to the conference, and touched with realism every discussion of the purposes for which the group had assembled. Bishop Manning's action was a flagrant illustration of what our denominational system means. For whether it finds expression in overt acts like this or in potential and tacit understandings by which its routine processes are carried on, our denominational system means that all Christians and all Christian churches are not equal before God, but that some Christian churches have precedence in the mind of God in contrast to other Christian churches.

It is well, then, that this disclosure of an already existing fact was made just as the members were stepping over the threshold into a conference on Christian unity. They had a text upon which to base their discussions. And the further they went in expounding this text the more clear it became that its implications were not for Bishop Manning alone, or for the Episcopal communion alone, but for all denominations in varying degrees. Dr. W. H. P. Faunce brought this out on the last day with telling effect. Deploring the episode, he also welcomed it as a revelation of the reality in which we are all involved. He admonished his hearers against the fallacy of letting their condemnation rest exclusively upon the Episcopal bishop of New York. Speaking as a Baptist, Dr. Faunce pointed out that if Bishop Manning should present himself for membership in a Baptist or Disciples church, he would not be received as a Christian, but would be compelled to submit to rebaptism! Thus, he contended, all our denominations are tarred with the same stick, denying by our arrogant practices the equality with which all members of Christ's catholic body have been invested by the grace of God. The original indignation with which the bishop's prohibition was greeted, was thus soon translated into terms of self-examination and humility, and if any hand was raised to throw a stone it fell limp to its owner's side.

No doubt this mood of humility was reinforced by the courage and loyalty of the Episcopal members of the conference, notably Dr. Reiland, Dr. Robert Norwood, of St. Bartholomew's church, and Dr. W. Russell Bowie, of Grace church, to mention only members of the diocese of New York, and only representatives of the clergy. Other Episcopal clergymen and notable laymen showed by indubitable signs the humiliation which they suffered on account of the bishop's act in disfellowshiping the conference. In an address no less remarkable for its illumination of the subject than for its forthrightness of expression, Dr. Reiland welcomed the conference to his church and proceeded to characterize the authoritarian claims of the historic episcopate as "fiction." The episcopate does not derive from Christ, he declared, nor from the apostles; it came not by "revelation" but by "evolution." It was a "man-made institution," formed gradually to meet concrete situations. James, the brother of our Lord, the most powerful leader of the Jerusalem church, said Dr. Reiland, was not one of the twelve, and Paul, who did more for Christianity than all the other apostles put together, rested his claim to apostolic authority not upon any actual ordination by the apostles but upon a spiritual relationship with Christ.

Dr. Norwood's contribution to the conference was hardly second to that of Dr. Ainslie himself, the two men being much alike in radiating a spirit of brotherliness and courage which all feel is fed by some mystical contact with Christ. At the communion service which, by Dr. Coffin's invitation, was finally held in the chapel of Union Theological seminary, in addition to Dr. Wallace MacMullen, of the Metropolitan Methodist church, New York, Doctors Norwood and Reiland assisted Dr. Coffin. The position of these Episcopal clergymen was that though the bishop's authority must be deferred to in the matter of the use of the church property, they could not in good conscience refuse to have fellowship at the holy communion with those whose acceptance by Christ himself could not be denied.

No apology is needed for devoting so large a proportion of our space to the episode of the prohibition of the Lord's supper. The pertinency and importance of that episode are obvious. It remains to interpret the constructive purposes of the Christian Unity League as these purposes were disclosed and defined at the New York conference. The league has no intention of becoming an organization; it is an informal fellowship of individual Christians who believe in Christian unity and accept as the definite principle of its accomplishment the practice of the equality of all Christians before God. Any person in any denomination may become a member of this fellowship merely by signing the pact of Christian unity. The purpose is to create a body of opinion in every communion which will strive to bring the laws and practices of every communion into harmony with the mind of Christ, in so far as those practices are concerned with Christians of other communions. The pact implies no commitment as to the ultimate form of the united church. No doctrine or practice or institution of any communion is challenged, except and in so far as that doctrine or practice or institution is applied in a way that violates the Christian fellowship. No particular theory of the Lord's supper or baptism or orders or of the church itself, is implied in affixing one's signature to the pact of unity. Conceivably, every type of doctrinal and ecclesiastical theory which has found historic expression in our many denominations may be at home within the borders of this simple and informal compact.

The only conception which the pact of unity will not tolerate is the conception that one Christian has a Christian right to disfellowship another Christian, or that one Christian church has a Christian right to disfellowship another Christian church or a member of another Christian church, or that one Christian ministry has a Christian right to disfellowship another Christian ministry. Every such sectarian and schismatic "right" is repudiated by the recognition of the equality of all Christians before God.

As *The Christian Century* sees it, the method which the New York conference projected for the attainment of Christian unity involves three phases. The first is the development in all the churches of a body of opinion consciously working for Christian unity. The second is the discontinuance by our various communions of those practices which deny the unity and equality of all Christians and all Christian churches; or, putting it positively, the actual practice of Christian unity. The third is the mobilization of all our Christian resources for the building of a united church.

These three phases of the Christian unity movement are, in the main, though not wholly, sequential. They can all go on at the same time, in a certain fashion. But the Christian Unity League seems to be on the right course in emphasizing the first and second, and holding the third in abeyance. There is little profit in holding Lausanne conferences to consider the final unity of the church so long as Christians are not alive to the sin of disfellowshiping one another. The penitent repudiation of this prerogative and the reform of our practices with respect to it are the *sine qua non* of Christian unity. We can afford to hold off all consideration of the organic unity of the church until this practice which flouts the basic law of Christian morality, has been abandoned. To secure its abandonment, and the glad adoption of an affirmative practice of Christian unity, requires education and agitation designed to change the laws and the overt practices of our churches.

For this purpose the Christian Unity League appears to be the most promising kind of instrument that could be devised. Its simplicity, informality, and comprehensiveness would seem to make it the agency of a popular crusade operating in all the churches and in all parts of the country. It should be able to make vivid to the consciences of ecclesiastics, of church courts, of denominational conventions, of the clergy, of the official boards and vestries of local churches, and more important than all, of the laity whose thought processes have not been corrupted by theology — it should be able to make vivid that it is an elemental Christian duty to treat Christians as Christians, and Christian churches as Christian churches, and Christian ministers as Christian ministers, remembering always that what God has blessed no man may call unclean.

[From *The Christian Century,* Chicago.]

Recent Explosion Was a Good Thing

The decision of the bishop whether reprehensible or praiseworthy will no doubt work out for the good of us all. It reveals to the whole Christian world what kind of a church the Episcopal church is. It has a law which is so phrased as to make this sort of tragedy possible, when a man like Bishop Manning is bishop. If the law of the Episcopal church is such as to make it possible for a bishop to declare it illegal for a minister like Dr. Fosdick to officiate at a wedding in an Episcopal church edifice, and to render it illegal for a minister like Dr. Coffin to officiate at the Lord's supper, then it is a good thing for the whole world to know it, including the Episcopalians themselves. It will be sure to be talked about for many a month to come. And it ought to be. These are the very things which Christians ought to talk about. By talking about them we shall come by and by to understand them. It was a dramatic event — the moving of a communion service from St. George's church to the chapel of Union Seminary, all because the Episcopal bishop of New York would not allow the president of the Seminary to officiate at a communion service in an Episcopal church building. That stirs the blood of millions of Christians outside of the Episcopal communion but not a whit more than it stirs the blood of thousands of Episcopalians. Some of the most zealous and whole-hearted workers for church union are found in the Episcopal denomination. By union they mean union on equal terms. They believe in fellowship and courtesy and brotherly feeling. They do not cling to a theory which makes havoc of every attempt to achieve Christian unity. There are other Episcopalians who talk unity on terms on which no unity is possible. Their doctrine is divisive and their ideas are in flat contradiction of the ideas of the New Testament. They are ecclesiastical snobs and they hold themselves aloof in an isolation both pitiable and ludicrous. Any man who lifts up his voice constantly on behalf of church unity and who holds a theory which makes it impossible for any clergyman who has not received Episcopal ordination to perform a marriage service or officiate at a communion service in an Episcopal church edifice, talks forever in vain. All he says is sure to be laughed at or trampled in scorn.

The recent explosion was a good thing. It has brought us nearer the millennium. It has hastened the day of triumph for the cause represented in the conference in St. George's church. Causes in which God is at work move slowly but they move. He compels the stupidity and foolishness of men to praise him. Much of the trouble in the Episcopal church has been caused by the pernicious doctrine of apostolic succession. It is not stated in the American Episcopal Prayer Book but it has the force of law to the consciences of a multitude of Episcopalians. It is a superstition of remarkable vitality but it is doomed. Only recently it received another crushing blow. One of the outstanding scholars of the Anglican church is Canon Streeter of Oxford University. He has just issued a volume with the title of *The Primitive Church.* In this book he deals with the doctrine of apostolic succession. One of the greatest obstacles to church union is the belief that there is some one form of church order which alone is primitive and which therefore alone possesses the sanction of apostolic precedent. But Canon Streeter shows that this belief is an illusion. He finds that there was no one system of organization in the early church. There was no single form of church order laid down by the apostles or followed by the early churchmen. The system of government varied from church to church. There was no standardized uniformity. Some churches were Congregational, some were Presbyterian and others were Episcopalian. Dr. Streeter has gone into this subject most thoroughly and lays before us masses of evidence which cannot be explained away. He concludes that we are most true to the Primitive church not by trying to imitate its forms but by recapturing the spirit of adventurous experiment that characterized those early days. Other Anglican scholars had years ago arrived at the same conclusion, but it is helpful to have these conclusions confirmed by so clear a thinker and so thorough a scholar as Canon Streeter. There is no reason why the Episcopalian should look down on the Congregationalist or the Presbyterian. Both of them live under a form of church government as ancient as his own. Congregationalism and Presbyterianism have the sanction of the apostles as truly as Episcopalianism. There were different types of church order and one was as valid as the other. Ministers of other denominations have the same authority to administer the Lord's supper as any man on whose head an Episcopal bishop has laid his hands. Bishop Manning is not a whit superior to Dr. Coffin in his authority as an officiant at the table of our Lord. We all stand on an equal footing, and there is no reason why one group of Christians should ostracize another group.

[From Dr. Charles E. Jefferson in the *Broadway Tabernacle Tidings,* New York.]

Is the Protestant Episcopal Church a Protestant Church?

Is the Protestant Episcopal church in its very nature Protestant, and has it any right to that designation? Protestantism is not non-recognition of Rome, neither does the episcopacy have anything to do with it. The most Protestant church in the world, more Protestant than Lutheranism is to-day, namely, the Methodist, is "Episcopal," as are certain Protestant communions on the continent. It is not the rejection of ritualism — the most ritualistic service I have seen was in a Congregational church in London. No, Protestantism is not any of these things. Protestantism is the acceptance of the doctrine of "justification by faith" rather than by achievement or works, *which justification is a matter between the individual and Christ, without the mediation of either priest or sacraments.* It is the rejection of a priesthood of any sort except the priesthood of all believers. There is no provision in any ordination service of any Protestant communion for the ordination of "priests." Protestantism affirms the priesthood—and the equal priesthood—of all believers. Luther shouted it as a slogan, and every Protestant communion has been true to it. Protestants have no "priests"; they have "ministers." But the Episcopal church has "priests." The candidate for orders is ordained as a "priest," just as he is in the Roman Catholic church, and as he never is in a Protestant communion. The Episcopal church holds the Catholic conception of priesthood, absolutely foreign to the whole nature and genius of Protestantism, and holds it as tenaciously as does the Roman Catholic, insisting with the Roman Catholic that only a "priest" can serve at the altar. The Prayer Book of the church of England provides for a full confession by the sick to the visiting priest, who then addresses the penitent as follows: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who has left power to his church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe on him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences, *and by his authority committed to me I absolve thee from all* *thy sins,* in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." Of these words Cardinal Newman once said (see the *Apologia,* page 87), "I challenge, in the sight of all England, Evangelical clergymen to put on paper an interpretation of this form of words, consistent with their sentiments, which shall be less forced than the most objectionable of the interpretations which Tract XC puts upon any passage in the articles." As Professor Stewart intimates in *A Century of Anglo-Catholicism* (page 119), this challenge was distinctly embarrassing to the Evangelicals. Compare with this form of absolution in the Prayer Book of the church of England the words used by the Roman Catholic priest in the ritual of the sacrament of penance: "Finally, *I absolve thee from thy sins* in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." (This prayer of absolution, of which this is the close, begins with these words: *"I, by his authority, absolve thee," etc.* Can anyone imagine a Protestant using these words, as they thus appear in both the Anglican and Roman Catholic Prayer Books? Do Protestants anywhere claim this priestly prerogative? But if only a "priest" can officiate at the altar, of course no Protestant minister can officiate there. He is not a priest, except as all believers are priests, and there is not a bit more logic in a Protestant officiating at a Protestant Episcopal altar than at a Roman Catholic altar. Of course the Roman communion does not believe the Episcopalian priest is a priest, but that is not his fault. He believes himself to be a priest just as his communion believes him a priest. Personally, I believe he has just as good a claim to priesthood as has the Roman Catholic, for there is just as much evidence to support the unbroken apostolic succession in England as there is in Rome — and it is not very absolute anywhere. Yes, the Episcopalian minister is a "priest" — but there are no priests in Protestant churches.

It all comes to this: the Episcopalian church is much more closely identified with Catholicism than with Protestantism, and every attempt to practice church unity with Protestants proves it. I cannot help feeling that the Anglo-Catholic party which wishes to drop the word "Protestant" has not only all of the logic on its side, but all of the evidence, both historical and contemporary. Furthermore, every time the Episcopal church refuses to recognize the orders of a Protestant minister as equally valid with that of an Episcopalian priest, or refuses to permit a Protestant minister to officiate at its altars or even refuses to join in a common communion service with Protestants, it proves this contention. Would not the Episcopal church be much truer to both history and facts if it dropped the word "Protestant" from its title and called itself what it really is: "The Catholic Church"—Anglo-Catholic in England and American-Catholic in America? Then no Protestant minister would expect to be asked to share in officiating at its altars. He cannot, for the life of him, see why this act should be refused while the Episcopal church calls itself Protestant.

[From Dr. Frederick Lynch in *The Living Church,* Milwaukee, Wis.]

The World Laughs Out Loud

The world has come to the place where it laughs out loud at our sectarian folly. In this instance it is an Episcopalian, but it might have been a Disciple or a Baptist or a Lutheran or any one of the other denominations on those points upon which it has a sectarian conscience. That world that laughs is losing respect for us all and the pathos is that it angers us rather than leads us into repentance and reconciliation. The following is one of the samples, being duplicated in type and space as it appeared in the New York City *Journal,* November 20, 1929:

Brands of Christianity

They Must Be Separate.

Copyright, 1929, New York Evening Journal, Inc.
Registered U. S. Patent Office.

The Christian Unity League wanted to unite different brands of Christians and planned a communion service in St. George's Episcopal Church in New York.

Dr. Coffin, earnest, concentrated, good looking, was to preach. Bishop Manning, of the Episcopal Church, said that wouldn't do. Separate brands of Christianity must be preserved. So Dr. Coffin can't preach in St. George's Episcopal Church anyhow.

The Founder of Christianity said nothing about different brands of Christianity, Baptist, Methodist, Unitarian, Episcopalian, and might not approve of such fine distinctions. But you can't be sure. He might say ''It is a long time since I have been down there.

''Probably Bishop Manning knows best.''

Thirteen young Episcopalian clergymen have formally protested against Bishop Manning's ruling. But how could they know more than a bishop?

Plan of Union of the Congregational and Christian Churches

As Adopted by the National Council of Congregational Churches at Detroit, June 3, 1929, and by the General Convention of the Christian Church at Piqua, Ohio, October 25, 1929

I. Sec. 1. That the National Council of the Congregational churches and the General Convention of the Christian church be united under the title of the General Council of the Congregational and Christian churches (Unincorporated) looking toward complete union so soon as necessary legal steps can be taken, both national bodies to continue for the time being their organizations to meet legal requirements, while constituting the membership of the general organization. (Invitation is extended to other bodies to join this union. In the event of favorable action by one or more national bodies, it is agreed that a new and more inclusive name shall be chosen for the General Council.)

That the basis of this new relation shall be the recognition by each group that the other group is constituted of the followers of Jesus Christ. Each individual church and each group of churches shall be free to retain and develop its own form of expression. Finding in the Bible the supreme rule of faith and life, but recognizing that there is wide room for differences of interpretation among equally good Christians, this union shall be conditioned upon the acceptance of Christianity as primarily a way of life, and not upon uniformity of theological opinion or any uniform practice of ordinances.

Sec. 2. The purpose of the General Council shall be to perform on behalf of the united churches the various functions heretofore performed by the National Council for the Congregational churches and the General Convention for the Christian churches, it being understood that where technical legal questions may be involved the action of the separate bodies shall be secured.

That for the first four years the moderator of the National Council and the president of the General Convention shall be coördinate presiding officers, their service to be arranged by mutual agreement; that for the time being the secretary of the National Council and the secretary of the General Convention, while continuing their respective positions, shall be secretaries of the General Council under such division of responsibility as shall be determined by the General Council or its executive committee.

That regular meetings of the General Council be held biennially in the spring or early summer of odd numbered years, and that these be so arranged as that necessary business meetings of the National Council and of the General Convention may be held for legal action and other necessary business.

II. That pending possible mergers among themselves, the larger units (i.e. the five regional and the Afro-Christian conventions, the Congregational "state" conferences), and after merger the united bodies, shall severally be represented in the General Council by two delegates each, and each such convention or conference having churches whose aggregate membership is more than ten thousand shall be entitled to elect two additional delegates for each additional ten thousand members or major fraction thereof; provided that no conference with three or more churches shall be without representation.

III. That pending merger, local units (i.e. Christian conferences and Congregational district associations), and after merger the united bodies, be represented in the General Council on the basis of one delegate for every ten churches or major fraction thereof.

IV. That heads of church colleges and seminaries recognized by the General Council as affiliated with or coöperating with it, or with either communion, the National General secretaries as defined in the by-laws and editors of national church periodicals, together with the officers of the general national body, be members ex-officiis of the General Council.

V. That in order to conserve legal interest the charter of the General Convention of the Christian church and that of the corporation for the National Council of Congregational churches be continued in force unless and until it becomes possible and seems wise to combine them.

VI. That the voluntary declaration of the representatives of each communion to the effect that they and their work ought not to be a charge on the financial resources of the other be recognized as the general principle to govern in adjustment of financial obligations; that therefore for the time being the miscellaneous expenses of the General Council shall be prorated on the basis of the relative membership of the two denominations, and that the expenses incident to continuing any officer, service, or missionary enterprise now carried by either denomination, together with present indebtedness, shall be met from the resources of that fellowship. Here, however, the fact is taken into account that there may be natural shiftings of constituency from one denomination to the other, as also changes in the work to be done which will call for corresponding adjustments. It is recognized, however, that where the arrangement at the start is equitable the combined constituency can be trusted faithfully to care for the combined work without fear of discrimination. It is contemplated that during the period of transition savings in overhead expense are not to be expected, but that gradually such savings will result. It is hoped, however, that all will think of such economies as making more kingdom building possible rather than as lessening the challenge to the grace of giving.

VII. That the promotion of income for missionary and educational work be committed to a commission on missions of the General Council consisting of the members of the jointly elected official administrative mission boards (that is, for the Congregational churches, the prudential committee of the American board and the directors of the home board), nine members-at-large (of whom at least one shall be from the Christian constituency) and the two presiding officers and the two secretaries of the General Council ex-officiis.

VIII. That the functions of the General Council comparable to those now performed by the executive committees of the National Council and of the General Convention not otherwise provided for, be committed to an executive committee of the General Council composed of the members of the executive committee of the National Council (16 members), together with the president, vice-president, secretary, and treasurer of the General Convention.

IX. That the functions of the board of missions of the Christian Convention in the foreign field and those of the prudential committee of the American board of commissioners for foreign missions be discharged by one body composed of identical members until such time as the constituent corporations may be legally merged.

X. That the functions of the board of missions in the home field, the board of Christian education and the board of publications of the General Convention, and those of the group of societies known as the Congregational home boards, be discharged by one body composed of identical members until such time as the constituent corporations may be legally merged.

XI. It is conceived that during the transition the provisions of IX and X shall be worked out substantially as follows:

1. Until corporate merger can be effected the board of

missions of the Christian church shall by necessary action constitute the prudential committee of the American board its agent for the conduct of foreign missionary work, exclusive of that in Porto Rico, and the American board shall elect at least four members from the Christian constituency as full voting members of its prudential committee in the class of members-at-large.

2. That the board of missions, the board of Christian education, and the board of publications of the Christian churches shall by necessary action constitute the board of directors of the Congregational home boards, with its several administrative committees, their agents for home missions and church extension, Christian education and publication, and that at least four members from the Christian constituency be elected full voting members of the board of directors of the home board and a total of at least six members of the several administrative committees of the home board be elected from the Christian constituency, also two members of the foundation for education.

3. That missionary secretaries shall be appointed by the General Convention in such number as it may deem needful.

4. That the work of the board of missions of the Christian Convention in Porto Rico and at Franklinton College be transferred to the administrative committee serving the American Missionary Association, together with the resources for the maintenance of the same.

5. That agreeably with present practice responsibility for the work of home and foreign missions and church extension of the Afro-Christian Convention continue with that convention, its successor or successors, on the principle of self-supporting states among the Congregational churches.

XII. That the Christian Convention request the administrative committee on ministerial relief to further the cause of ministerial relief among the Christian churches with a view to bringing its ministry to a basis simlar to that of the Congregatonal churches and in the hope of ultimate oneness of this work. Further: That whereas the Christian churches now give a certain amount of ministerial aid through local and regional conferences and understanding it to be the desire of the Christian churches to bring about as soon as possible national administration of ministerial aid, and that the Christian churches will welcome the leadership of the administrative committee on ministerial relief in perfecting an adequate plan for the aid of their own aged and retired ministers until such time as the merger shall become more nearly complete; and further,

That inasmuch as the annuity fund for Congregational ministers seems to be legally forbidden to admit as members any except "Congregational" ministers, a movement be put on foot among the Christian churches to develop plans under which benefits comparable to those available for Congregational ministers shall be provided for ministers of the Christian churches, utilizing the experience and good offices of the Congregational ministerial boards.

XIII. That of necessity trust funds and moneys given for specific purposes must be administered strictly in accordance with the terms of trusts and the intention of donors so far as expressed. And further,

That until complete unity can be worked out all other moneys contributed by either group of churches shall be administered for the established work of those churches unless otherwise determined by the donors.

XIV. That the present status of educational institutions with reference to their denominational bodies be preserved, and that where mergers of educational institutions are possible they be encouraged.

XV. That the General Council name a commission on evangelism and devotional life to consist of the members of the commission on evangelism of the National Council, twenty-four in number, plus three persons chosen from the Christian church constituency. This commission shall promote a program of evangelism and devotional life in all the churches. With a view to conserving all spiritual values, the commission on evangelism of the National Council shall be wholly free to adapt the general program to the needs of the Congregational churches and the representatives of the Christian church shall be equally free to do likewise for the Christian churches. The work for life service, for which the board of evangelism is now responsible in the Christian church, shall be committed to the student life department of the home board.

XVI. The work of the board of finance of the Christian Convention in the field of benevolence being committed to the commission on missions, its responsibility for the finances of the General Convention itself and its share of the expenses of the General Council may be retained or committed to the members of the executive committee of the General Council who represent the Christian constituency, as may be determined by the General Convention.

XVII. That the business of publishing be combined as far as possible; that in particular a common year book shall be issued in the immediate future on the general tabular scheme of the Congregational year book and that in this year book for the time being at least all churches be published together for a given state or district, with separate sub-headings in each schedule for the Christian and Congregational churches, or with distinguishing marks as may be determined.

In case the home board as constituted above should deem it unwise to administer the Christian Publishing Association building and printing plant in Dayton, Ohio, the General Convention shall be wholly free to make use of or dispose of this plant as it deems wise.

XVIII. That periodicals be merged as soon as the way is clear and to the extent found desirable. *The Herald of Gospel Liberty* and *The Congregationalist* may well be merged, possibly under a wholly new name. If, however, it should seem better to either group to continue indefinitely both periodicals, this may be done without breach of the spirit of unity, financial responsibility being carried by the respective constituencies.

XIX. That the woman's mission board of the General Convention of the Christian church shall be entirely free to determine its own course of action. The recommendation is strongly made, however, that its activities be applied to the whole program of the church in coöperation with the woman's organizations in the Congregational church.

XX. That the appointment of bureaus and commissions be determined with the view of conserving all the recognized activities of both churches.

XXI. That a similar policy apply to representation in interdenominational and other bodies.

XXII. That in view of the requirement that beneficiaries of the C. B. M. R. and members of the annuity fund for Congregational ministers must be Congregational ministers, ministerial ordination and standing be continued separately but with the endeavor to reach common standards as soon as possible.

XXIII. That regional, state, and local organizations of each denomination, being wholly self-determining, be free to continue as at present, with full fellowship in the General Council, but that conference with these bodies be had with a view to unification on lines comparable with the proposals for national union.

That in states or districts where the churches of one denomination are very few these might simply unite with the other body, retaining their name locally if desired; likewise, that in districts where the number is greater but still relatively quite few, these might be united with the other body as a unit, continuing their own name, as for example, the Christian association of the Massachusetts Congregational conference, thus retaining their denominational connection while uniting with the Congregationalists but without requiring the organization of a new state body. Likewise, for example, there could be the Congregational conference in affiliation with the North Carolina Christian convention or conference.

Each local church may continue wholly unchanged in name and in organization. Any changes which seem wise may be made by the churches themselves, but it is recommended that the joint commission appoint an advisory commission, representative of the General Convention and the National Council, to assist conferences, associations, conventions, and churches on all matters involved in the readjustment of their organization, legal affairs, and programs in line with this plan of union, this commission to be empowered to appoint local commissions for such adjustments whenever and wherever occasion may cause and such advice be sought.

XXIV. That the General Convention of the Christian church and the National Council of Congregational churches be requested to act on the proposals at the earliest possible date; that so soon as these or other plans are approved by the two commissions, constitution and by-laws for the General Council be drawn up, embodying the principles decided upon, these to be offered to the National Council and to the General Convention for consideration.

XXV. In conclusion, these plans and recommendations of necessity deal with legal and technical details, but they have their justification in the spirit of unity which they presuppose and are designated to promote. If a desire for that unity for which the Master once prayed by the actuating motive of all plans and all acts, the way will become clear, as we proceed, where now it may appear filled with uncertainties, hesitation, and hindrance. We may be sure that no legal entanglements will be too difficult, no ecclesiastical customs too deeply fixed, no sentiments seem too precious to yield, no ambitions or personal commitments too intense, if the will to achieve be ours and the Spirit of God lead us. Going forward, thus led, we may ourselves secure, and may make plain to others, the road to joyous fellowship and enlarged usefulness.

[From *The Herald of Gospel Liberty,* Dayton, Ohio.]

The Reunion of the Scottish Church

On October 2nd of last year an event took place in Edinburgh which is reasonably regarded as the most significant ecclesiastical happening in Scotland since the close of the seventeenth century; for on that day there appeared in the land the church of Scotland, United, National and Free. No one who was present could fail to be touched by the deep feelings which were evoked amongst all classes of the populace, when, to the sound of soft singing of the psalms of David by the crowds that lined the streets, the two streams of representatives blended as they entered St. Giles cathedral to give thanks to God. It was an occasion, not only in the history of the church but in the history of the nation; for Scottish history and the history of the Scottish church are one. Still more, it was an occasion on which, in this so often disappointing world, dreams of good men were coming true; and the heart of the people was thankful and glad.

For the future historian, the date will be significant for this—that in one country at least a right arrangement has been arrived at between those ancient foes, who should always be allies, namely, the church and the state. The long and detailed story of Scottish secession and disruption is at bottom a simple one, for it consists solely of the efforts of evangelically-minded men to secure for the Christian society the right to live its own life and do its own work, in the way which it holds to be pleasing to its Lord. From time to time certain Scottish presbyters held that that desire was being frustrated by the intrusion of the civil power, and that such intrusion was rendered possible by the fact that church and state stood in a wrong relation. Consequently, they left the establishment and founded branches of the church in different relations to the civil power; some of them coming ultimately to believe that the ideal would be found when the two authorities would mutually ignore each other. Unfortunately for that hope, the church has to hold property: and the state is never going to ignore property-holders. As a judge of appeal remarked in the notorious Free church case in 1900, the basic principle of organized communities since the days of Cyrus has been that a man should be secure in that which belongs to him; and, if any question arises as to what does belong to him, the state will fail in its first duty if it does not step in and determine the matter. What applies to a man applies also to an associated body of men, even if that associated body is pleased to call itself a church. Unless the state recognizes the church as something different from all other associations; unless it admits that the church is a living thing, with the powers of change and development and growth which are the marks of life; the church, whenever it wants to express its faith in new terms, or to adapt its organization to new conditions, must go cap in hand to Parliament to "alter the trust." In short, when it came to matters of property the state regarded a Free church as a society on a level with a gas corporation; or, in the case of an Established church, as a department of itself, which it could order about as it pleased. The supreme recent instance of the former is the Free church decision in 1904, and of the latter the rejection of the revised prayer-book two years ago.

Now, in Scotland the intrusion of the state into the affairs of the church hit the people on an extremely sensitive nerve. What Presbyterians want, and are determined to have, is the right to select the man who is to be their minister—or at least to be able to refuse a man obviously unfit for the position. But, for over a century and a half, that right was denied in the church of Scotland. The right of "presentation" by the heritors (or landlords), with certain inconsiderable modifications, held the field; and, from time to time, the right was scandalously abused, with the result that the people revolted. For instance, in the middle of the eighteenth century, a predecessor of the present writer was minister of the New North church of Edinburgh, and, for the time being, moderator of presbytery. He appears to have been a vivacious person, with a vigorous right hand; for during his moderatorship he called out the military to enforce the induction of some crony of his own into the charge of the Tron church, against the violent protests of eleven hundred heads of families in the parish. There could be only one result from action of that sort. The offended parishioners withdrew and formed themselves in praying-societies, and ultimately became organized into Brisco church — the mother church of the secession in eastern Scotland.

Thus, during the eighteenth century, the children of freedom (who finally became the United Presbyterian church), under various leaders like Erskine and Gillespie, struck at the shackles of the state. But the matter came to a climax in 1843, when, for the same proximate reason, the church of Scotland was riven in two. In this case, the intrusion of the state was more heinous; for it compelled an unwilling presbytery to induct a presentee, which the presbytery itself declined to induct. From that time onward, the Scottish church was divided into three streams, until, in 1900, the Free church and the United Presbyterians became one in the United Free church; only to find, four years later, that it had jumped from the frying-pan into the fire in respect to state relations. Instead of being a kind of state department, it had become a business corporation, with no better title in the eyes of the law than that of "beneficiaries under the trust." It was free, indeed, to do what it chose; but only at the cost of the loss of all its goods—which is a comic kind of freedom. Evidently the problem of the relation of church and state was not yet solved.

Meantime, the church of Scotland had made a most remarkable recovery. In 1843 she had lost a very serious proportion of her best ministers and people, and the earlier secessions had also taken their toll of some of the most eager and progressive elements in the nation's life, particularly amongst the industrial leaders in Glasgow: but by 1900 a new spirit had developed in the State church, which made her brethren regard her with new eyes. The fact was that the flame of evangelical religion, which lay behind the demand for spiritual independence, had set her on fire also, and expressed itself in conspicuous missionary work abroad, and a truly effective social enthusiasm at home. A quarter of a century earlier patronage of livings had disappeared; so that when, in 1904, the blow fell on the United Free church, which taught it that the state can make itself exceedingly unpleasant to a "free" church, the church of Scotland arose, not as an opponent, but as a friend, to secure redress and ultimately establish new relations which would make such happenings impossible again. The way was open for the movement inaugurated by Dr. Archibald Scott of St. George's, Edinburgh—to whose admirable memory be all honor—for unrestricted conferences on the causes which were keeping the churches apart.

These conferences immediately displayed two facts. On the one hand, the United Free church would enter into no union in which spiritual independence was not wholly secured. But, on the other hand, the church of Scotland had its *sine qua non.* It would enter into no union which did not secure the national recognition of religion. That principle had been somewhat neglected by the United Free church; but when it came to be examined it proved to be a real and living thing. It enunciated that the community organized for government ought to recognize him by whom kings reign and princes decree judgment; that it must have an organ through which such recognition could be made on national occasions; and that it should possess an organ which would be responsible for the religious well-being of those sections of the people which other churches were unable to reach. In Scotland, by every dictate of history, sentiment and common sense, that organ must be the reconstituted church of Scotland.

The achievement consummated on October 2nd is, therefore, the achievement of securing a relation to the state in which these two principles of spiritual independence and the national recognition of religion have been blended. First, the church of Scotland declared its constitution afresh in the famous articles of 1921, in which spiritual independence is enunciated with a clarity and completeness far beyond the most optimistic dreams of the disruption fathers; all previous statutes, in so far as they conflict therewith being held to be null and void. At the same time, the historic continuity of the church of Scotland as the church of Scotland is retained, not only for the present, but for the future, in any further unions which it may enter on, within the limits of the trinitarian reformation—these limits being imposed by the church herself. By virtue of these articles, the church of Scotland, as now constituted, becomes not only a united, but a uniting church, armed with both purpose and power to heal further breaches in the Christian body. This constitution was acknowledged by Parliament, which thereby, it is hardly too much to say, for the first time put the conception of a church on the statute-book; the conception, that is, to-day of a living, growing society, which could express her life and growth in action, without fear of loss of her goods or of denial of her own identity. By a subsequent act, the inherited property of the establishment, including teinds (or tithes), were—on terms that involved some loss to the church, it is true — handed over to her sole keeping and administration; and, at long last, the "causes which kept the churches apart" had ceased to be.

For this result credit must be given where credit is due. The movement would not have begun when it did, or in the spirit that it did, but for the trust inspired by that very Scottish Scot, Dr. Archibald Scott, who set the ball a-rolling.

Nor would the movement have continued to move, if Dr. James Denney had put his shoulder in front of the wheel, instead of behind it. There was a time when defeat or success depended solely on his choice. He hated privilege, and he had the oldest secession traditions in his soul. But he became convinced, not only that spiritual independence was guaranteed, but that the historic continuity of the church as the national organ was worth preserving. I can remember the intake of breath from the assembly, when with a sudden lifting of his voice he declared, "I would not give an inch of history, with its blood and tears and passion, for a whole wilderness of propositions." As we walked away a friend said, "Well, that settles it. Union is going to be."

But, through the whole course of the negotiations, the chief weight has fallen on four men, two on either side. The gratitude of his countrymen cannot too fully be given to Lord Sands, the chief author (according to common belief) of the 1921 articles. They are the crux of this matter. Unfortunately, they are too long to quote; any one who desires to understand the situation fully should obtain and study them. But the man who had so large a share in shaping them, as he looks on the church he loves and has served so well, may rest in the knowledge of great work well done. Dr. John White, the first moderator of the reunited church, was not only mainly instrumental in securing the difficult and aggravating financial arrangements with the government, but has been the energy of the movement in the church of Scotland. His resource, his initiative, his driving-power, and, above all, his blazing passion outdid Zerubbabel in moving mountains. On the other side, one name, not greatly known outside Scotland, stands preëminent. Dr. Archibald Henderson of Crieff carried on, more than any one else, the traditions of the disruption. As a little boy he shared in it; as an old man he all but healed it. He was late in coming to his kingdom, for during the larger part of his life he was overshadowed by the dominating figure of Principal Rainy. But when the hour came, he was the man for it. His knowledge was singularly wide—I well remember his chuckles when he once caught out two theological professors in a theological error—and his mind worked with a speed only equalled by its exactness. But what every one did not know was the anxiety for the Christian good of his land which animated him. On one occasion, after a vexing meeting, I travelled with him as far as Gleaneagles on his way home. He would listen to nothing in the way of pessimism. "Glasgow," he cried, "we must unite for the great city. The cause of the Lord demands it." Indeed, we must never forget that in Scotland, as in Canada, the final impulsion to union came from the simple perception that Christian men cannot afford to stand apart watching the people perish.

Many other names might be mentioned who did admirable service. Dr. Wallace Williamson, and in latter days Lord Constable, Dr. Drummond and Dr. Bogle—all these will not be forgotten. But "the big four" conclude with Principal Martin. It is due to him, more than to any man, that the union is practically unanimous, and that those who departed from the final assembly of the United Free church went with unwilling feet and with no bitterness in their hearts. It has been a wonderful triumph, not simply for mental achievement—though high legal authorities have given testimony to Dr. Martin's easy intellectual ascendency over them—but to the unruffled patience and sympathy of a great Christian man.

So at last the dream came true. Amongst crowds, which spontaneously sang "Behold, how good a thing it is, and how becoming well," and "A river is whose streams do glad," and many another familiar psalm, the two assemblies mingled in the High street, and "in unity to dwell" entered St. Giles to give thanks to God. As we waited for the service to begin, all Scotland, past and present, seemed to be gathered together. There were the memorials to Argyle and to Montrose. Here were walls that once echoed to the voice of John Knox. Yonder were living men directly descended from Covenanters. A grandson of Cavendish was not far from a grandson of Norman Macleod. And in the royal pew stood the handsome young figure of the king's son and representative, wearing a Highland tartan that less than two hundred years ago would have received short shrift in an Edinburgh street. Shortly thereafter that same king's son was to utter some simple words that would mean that the long strifes of the Scottish church were truly at an end. Until the adoption of the 1921 articles a curious little formula at the close of the church of Scotland assemblies indicated the divided *imperium,* which has been the source of our troubles. The moderator used to announce, in words like these, "*I* declare this assembly adjourned, and appoint it to meet on such and such a date next year." Whereupon the royal commissioner would rise and announce, "*I* declare this assembly adjourned and appoint it to meet." Which was the operative declaration was a nice point; but that it should be a point at all indicated a doubt as to spiritual independence. But at this assembly, after the moderator had made his declaration, the duke of York replied, "*I note* that you have declared this assembly adjourned and have appointed it to meet; and shall so inform the king, my father." What a tiny change of words; but what a world of sacrifice and tears and effort and hope lies behind it!

On Octover 4th we met for holy communion in St. Giles. It was a morning of bright, fitful sunshine, mingled with sudden, playful gusts of wind, that blew little bursts of rain here and there across the city—the very morning for a rainbow. And, sure enough, just as we were entering the cathedral, it came—hesitated, wavered and then stood fixed in clear brilliance, with, as it seemed, one end of the arc touching St. Giles and the other, the Assembly Hall. Men still record how, at the disruption, a ray of light shone from a cloudy sky when the words of the opening psalm, "O! send Thy light forth," were given out. After the same manner, our children will speak of that rainbow, the ancient sign of the covenant of God; for the "stumbling-block is removed out of the way" of the people of the Scottish church, and in union and in freedom they may seek together the things that belong unto peace.

Note—Any who desire to know the details of relation of the reunited Scottish church to the state cannot do better than obtain Principal Martin's pamphlet, "Church Union in Scotland, the First Phase Completed" (published by Macniven and Wallace, Edinburgh; price, one shilling), and his address at the opening of the United Free church assembly in May of last year (published by the same firm; price, sixpence). The former of these quotes the 1921 articles *in extenso,* and subjects them to a detailed analysis.

[From Rev. J. R. P. Slater, in *The Canadian Journal of Religious Thought,* Toronto.]

BOOK REVIEWS

Um Kirchliche Einheit. By Max Pribilla, S. J., Verlag Herder, Freiburg im Bresgau (B. Herder Book Co., 15 and 17 S. Broadway, St. Louis, Mo.); 332 pages; price, $2.85.

This volume is a historical, theological treatment of church unity by a Jesuit scholar and the sub-title *Stockholm-Lausanne-Rome* indicates the nature of the discussion here presented. In accord with the well-known policy of the Catholic church to keep abreast of all significant ecclesiastical and theological developments and interpret them from her own definitely formulated point of view, we have here what might fairly be called the Catholic *apologia* on Christian unity. The introductory chapter gives a concise, well-documented summary of non-Catholic efforts at church union, properly emphasizing the fundamentally divisive tendency inherent in Protestantism, and then the remainder of the book is centered upon Stockholm and Lausanne. It is well known that the Catholic church was not officially present at either of these conferences and this book gives the religious world the reason why. The treatment throughout shows real insight and sympathy.

The analysis of Stockholm indicates two radically different views of the kingdom of God: the entirely spiritual, incomprehensible, other-worldly Lutheran view and the active, aggressive, conquering, visible, practical, this-worldly Calvinistic idea. Both of these positions are valid, according to this writer, but both are equally inadequate, and the Catholic church bridges the (for the Protestants ever unbridgeable) chasm between and unites them both in her fold.

According to published records it is not certain that the pope was invited to Stockholm, but there is no uncertainty on that part in regard to Lausanne. Stockholm was foredoomed to failure in attempting to discuss Life and Work without reference to Faith and Order. Lausanne was foredoomed to failure because it did not frankly return to the Catholic church, the original and only basis of unity. Rome could not come to the conference because that would be to recognize the existence of other churches than herself, which she has consistently refused to do. From the Roman point of view unity will come when Protestants return as penitents to her fold, confessing their error in going away and accepting all that as Protestants they had discarded. Rome will join no unity conference with churches, she awaits for *individuals* to come as converts again to her, for the Catholic church represents the perfect expression and guardian of the complete and infallible revelation of Christ. Unless Protestants expect her to give up that age-old view they need not invite Rome to conferences. Protestants might reasonably not be required to subscribe to those doctrines which the Catholics have adopted since they went out from the fold (so it would seem to us!!), such as the immaculate conception and the infallibility of the pope, though this book makes no such compromise offer.

At the same time, however, Catholics are glad to coöperate with all in practical, ethical, social enterprises which make for the general good of mankind and this author recommends the League of Nations as being well suited (when certain imperfections are eliminated) as an agency for international coöperation between all religiously minded persons on such a basis.

Because of its sympathetic, scholarly treatment, (noting all important continental as well as American literature on the subject), consistent and dignified from the Catholic point of view, this is a real contribution to the literature on Christian unity. Too bad for us Americans that it is not in English! A valuable appendix contains the correspondence with the Vatican relative to Stockholm and Lausanne, two letters of Pope Leo xiii, a letter of Cardinal Gibbons to Dr. Peter Ainslie, etc.

Selby Vernon McCasland,
Goucher College.
(Professor of Biblical Literature)

The Reunion of Christendom. A Survey of the Present Position by Cardinal Bourne, Archbishop Germanos, Dr. Otto Dibelius, Archbishop Söderblom, et al. Edited by Sir James Marchant, K.B.E., LL.D. New York: Henry Holt and Company; pages 329; price $3.00.

It is well to take stock, from time to time, in order to observe where we are. This is a stock taking book on where we are in Christian unity. Cardinal Bourne of England speaks for the Roman Catholic church and it is the accustomed call for all to come to Rome. Archbishop Germanos speaks for the Eastern Orthodox church, which, he says, "is the true church of Christ on earth in that it has faithfully abided by the gospel and apostolic tradition, consecrated through the mysteries ordained by our Lord and the apostles, and led by the shepherds in a direct unbroken line of succession from the apostles themselves down to our own times," and "it in no way denies that God may show his mercy to those also who are outside the realm of his true church." Dr. Otto Dibelius speaks for the Protestant churches in Germany, where Protestantism falls into Lutheran, Calvinist, and United church domains, and "denominational consciousness is stronger than formerly." "No German church is in a position to allow its doctrinal traditions to be touched." "Also, in respect to its ministerial orders, German Protestantism stands by its reformation traditions," having the episcopal orders.

Archbishop Söderblom speaks for the church of Sweden, which has never called itself officially Lutheran, although it belongs to the Evangelic

Lutheran confession. He uses the term "Evangelic" as an analogy to Catholic, rather than the term "Evangelical," which seems, he says, to suggest a certain type of piety. He says, "The church is already one, as we confess in the third article of our creed. She consists of the souls in heaven and on earth, who have a life in God and his Christ. Her unity is visible already now in deeds of love and truth and justice, in prayer, in the word, and sacraments." Bishop F. T. Woods speaks for the church of England, which, he says, has never, since the break up of the medieval church, been content with the divisions which resulted. He calls it, in the phrase of Bishop Gore, a bridge-church, recognizing that episcopal, presbyteral, and congregational systems of government have been for centuries accepted by the great communions of Christendom and, therefore, "should gladly bring to the common life of the united church its own spiritual treasures." He says, "The English church is called to be the exhibition in Christendom of a church with many divergent elements: fundamentally Catholic in doctrine and government, yet shot through with evangelical fervor; utterly loyal to the Bible, yet open to learn whatever, through any avenue, the Spirit has to teach; in fact, to exhibit the specimen framework of a reunited church." Dr. Alfred S. Garvie speaks for the Free churches in England. He distinguishes between absolute spiritual and relative historical values, the first claiming the validity of religious convictions and the second appearing only as practical considerations. He says, "I cannot myself find any justification for the assumption that Christ himself imposed any organization—episcopal, presbyteral, or congregational—on his church as alone permanently and universally valid or regular, because essential to the fulfilment of his purpose as Son of God and Savior of men."

Dr. J. Scott Lidgett speaks for the Wesleyan Methodist church and says that the demand for unity is so organic in Christian faith and life as to be ceaseless in its strivings for satisfaction and fulfilment, and he makes his approach by the way of the epistle to the Ephesians, as "the guide-book to the meaning of Christian unity and to the conditions that govern its fulfilment." Dr. Alexander Martin speaks for church union in Scotland and discusses the recent union of the church of Scotland and the United Free church. Bishop William T. Manning speaks for the Protestant Episcopal church and its relation to the movement for Christian reunion. He tells how the Protestant Episcopal church initiated the movement for the World Conference on Faith and Order and mentions that while the Protestant episcopal church is fundamentally and essentially Catholic, it is "also truly Protestant in the original and historic meaning of that word, not as opposing that which is Catholic, but as witnessing for the Catholic faith and against mediæval or modern departures from it. She stands for the historic orders and sacraments on the one hand and for the open Bible on the other."

Dr. William Adams Brown speaks for the churches of the United States, discussing federal and organic union, the attitude of the American churches toward reunion, the accomplishments of Lausanne, and cautious advances in those things that remain to be done. Dr. T. Albert Moore speaks for the United church of Canada, giving an account of the steps in negotiations from 1904 to the consummation of the union. Bishop Vedenayakan Azariah speaks for the Anglican church in India where the problem, he says, is slightly different from the same problems in the Christian west. He recognizes that disunion on the mission fields is an offense and stumbling block and discusses the Indian movement for reunion, especially emphasizing "a ministry acknowledged by every part of the church as a position that requires careful consideration." The concluding chapter is by Dr. W. E. Orchard on "A Vision of the Reunited Church," in which he argues for a church containing many of our existing diversities, but embracing in a unity that which would be recognized by all to be a fulfilment of our Lord's purpose and prayer for his church. He says, "The reunited church is, therefore, a vision of what it is believed lies not far beyond the horizon, and can be seen by any one who will take a wide enough view and look steadily at all the facts actually visible."

The whole book is a well done piece of work and is a fair presentation of the various angles to the reunion of Christendom. But there has got to be some liberal readjusting of many positions set forth in this book if we are to have a reunited Christendom. It is well to take stock to see where we are, but, if we would do business, we have got to do more than stock taking.

THE BIBLE THROUGH THE CENTURIES. By Herbert L. Willett. Chicago: Willett, Clark and Colby: pages 337; price $3.00.

In the last few years a great many books have appeared dealing with the Bible. This book will take a first place among the best of these. It is written with such clarity and comprehension that it makes the story of the Bible intensely fascinating. It covers those admirable points of interest, such as origins, authorships, inspiration and great personalities, of which every person ought to have some definite knowledge.

It goes back to the beginnings and looks forward to the continuing word. It covers the whole Bible and, at the same time, gives the background out of which the Bible came. "By all odds the greater portion of human events, though not those of major importance, lie in the period before the days of the Bible, and the task of the historian and archæologist is to recover as much as possible of that ancient and largely unrecorded past. Against this background of experience, custom and belief, the Bible has a unique and commanding position."

The teachers of Israel were the prophets, the priests, and the wise men or sages. Dr. Willett discusses their contribution in four chapters. One of the essential features in worship is music. This chapter is particularly beautiful, revealing the author's fine poetic attitude. The Hebrew hymns were composed by all kinds of people and through all the periods of their natural history. "As in case of the relation of Moses to the law, and of Solomon to the wisdom books, so that of David to the Psalms would seem to have been ideal and traditional rather than actual." "Like the literature of all other peoples the writers of the Bible included parables, traditions, fables, and myths in the material which they employed," nothing being more attractive than a narrative, whether it be fact or fiction. The literature of apocalypse was confined to the period 200 B. C. to 200 A. D., belonging to a circle of initiated believers. Out of constant revision came the Old Testament.

Archæological research has given, in many ways, the most important service to our understanding of early history, so that long buried cities have given up their secrets. Incidents revealed in the Bible are now attested by records dug up from the earth. It has been among the most romantic accomplishments in scientific research. The half mythical has become verified knowledge.

Hebrew history, with its religious and political movements, began about 1250 B.C. with the arrival of the tribes in Canaan and closed with the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. After that we deal with the Jews and Judaism, and "strictly speaking neither the Old Testament nor the New relate primarily to the Jewish people." The Old Testament is a surviving literature of the Hebrew race during the time when the Hebrew was a living tongue. Consequently it is "a misuse of terms to speak of the Hebrews of the Old Testament as Jews, just as it is quite unhistorical to apply the term Hebrew to the modern Jew." The Jews do not need the glory of the Hebrews to give them a place in the sun; they have made a great history for themselves. A whole chapter is given to the other sacred books of the world, being for particular people and limited areas, but "the Bible is for every age and all mankind."

The making of the New Testament was the work of preachers rather than writers. Jesus left no document. The first book of this selection to appear was Paul's first epistle to the Thessalonians, which was twenty years after the close of Jesus' ministry. It grew first out of Paul's writings and then came the gospels. The settlement of the question of canonicity was made by Eusebius of Cæsarea (270-341 A.D.) The selection of the twenty-seven books was not a matter of rapid progress. Biblical criticism has made a great contribution to the understanding of the integrity, authenticity, credibility, and historical value of the documents which make up our collection of sacred writings. Translations, revisions, inspiration and authority are treated at such length and satisfaction as to give vivid and convincing understanding. The last chapter deals with "the continuing word," being the life of God in the lives of men and women, who are the living word.

It is a book of unusual charm and may be read with great profit by the man on the street who is interested in finding accurate knowledge of the Bible in its growth and service through the centuries.

THE SOCIAL SOURCES OF DENOMINATIONALISM. By H. Richard Niebuhr, Eden Theological Seminary. New York: Henry Holt and Company: pages 304; price $2.50.

The social approach to Christian unity is far less artificial than the theological approach. This study opens up a worth while field in the ethical problems of denominationalism. The author has threaded his way so satisfactorily to the social sources of our denominations that he must be hailed as a pioneer in a field that has practically been unsurveyed until his genius led him into this study of another angle to Christian unity.

Theology does not now and never has dominated religious thinking so prominently as many think. The thesis of this book is that the causes of schism have been social rather than theological. Neither polity nor theology is as important a characteristic as are the cultural types of our denominations. We have tried to think theologically and church history largely rests upon that artificial basis. Theology is somewhat conditioned by social circumstances.

Says Dr. Niebuhr, "Denominationalism in the Christian church is such an unacknowledged hypocrisy. It is a compromise, made far too lightly, between Christianity and the world. Yet it often regards itself as a Christian achievement and glorifies its martyrs as bearers of the cross. It represents the accommodation of Christianity to the caste-system of human society. It carries over into the organization of the Christian principle of brotherhood the prides and prejudices, the privilege and prestige, as well as the humiliations and abasements, the injustices and inequalities of that specious order of high and low wherein men find the satisfaction of their craving for vainglory. The division of the churches closely follows the division of men into the castes of national, racial, and economic groups. It draws the color line in the church of God: it fosters the misunderstandings, the self exaltations, the hatreds of jingoistic nationalism by continuing in the body of Christ the spurious differences of provincial loyalties; it seats the rich and the poor apart at the table of the Lord, where the fortunate may enjoy the bounty they have provided while the others feed upon the crusts their poverty affords."

He continues to show that while denominations are religious groups with religious purposes, they are emblems of the victory of the world over the church and, therefore, denominationalism represents the moral failure of Christianity. It is a grave condition. If brotherhood cannot be made a reality among Christians it is an idle dream to think of the triumph of Christianity.

He discusses the churches of the disinherited, the churches of the middle class, nationalism and the churches, sectionalism and denominationalism in America, churches of the immigrants, denominationalism and the color line, and, in the last chapter, he points out the way to Christian unity. He shows that denominationalism is no more able to stem the tide of disintegration in the world than it is able to set bounds to the process of disintegration within itself. "Some active motive sufficient to overcome denominational self-consciousness and inertia is required for the actual union of churches." Competition will not do it; national churches may lead to greater subordination of Christian ethics to national ethics than now prevails, opening the way to more serious rifts in Christianity than now exists. The other-worldly faith cannot do it: but the Christianity of the gospels contains the required ideal. A denominational Christianity cannot function in this. It must be a church that practices complete fellowship within the house of God. "It requires from its members the sacrifice of privilege and pride and bids each count other better than himself." This is the hope of Christianity and the hope of the world. It is not an easy way. It is by the road of repentance.

Dr. Niebuhr has presented a fine line of reasoning. He has gone into new fields of thought. It is really a remarkable book, which we most heartily commend.

WHAT HAPPENED IN PALESTINE. By Maurice Samuel, author of *You Gentiles*, etc. Boston: The Stratford Company: pages 227; price $2.00.

Anything that happens in Palestine awakens world-wide interest. No people have a more fascinating history than the Jews and there is no land so rich in romance as Palestine. This book is a detailed account of recent happenings there from an eyewitness. There are about 160,000 Jews in Palestine amid a population of Arabs numbering four or five times those figures. These Arabs are largely ignorant and indolent; the Jews there are largely educated and industrious. The clash between the two races has been outwardly religious, but it is really an instance of economic friction. The Arabs sell their poor land at high prices and, under Jewish cultivation, it becomes very productive, which necessarily increases its value, and there is friction. The British policy could be improved, according to Mr. Samuel, especially safe-guarding those days and places that are held sacred by each group until by some educational method both races arise above quarreling over days and places. But until that is done the economic problem will be a serious factor in Palestine. Maybe the Jews can become helpers to their Arab brethren, as they have been to brethren of other races, by establishing an understanding in thrift and industry. Their work in Palestine would become twofold and be of far more value to mankind than if it were solely for Jewish interest. It is a valuable book on a much misunderstood question.

A New Book from the Press of
Willett, Clark & Colby, Chicago

"The Scandal of Christianity"

By

PETER AINSLIE

Contents

I. The Blight of Denominationalism.
II. Denominationalism at a Discount in the Eyes of an Intelligent World.
III. The Awkwardness of Denominationalism in the Face of Equality of Christians before God.
IV. There is No Alternative: Church History Must Be Rewritten.
V. The Hurt to Christianity Through Denominational "Voices" — the Denominational School and the Denominational Paper.
VI. Can the World be Christianized by a Denominational Christianity?
VII. What is the Hope for the Cure of the Scandal?

This book has been in the hands of reviewers for the last eight months. Many have given lengthy reviews, some editorial reviews. It has been commended and attacked. *The Survey* says: "It is a blazing, blistering excoriation of the whole denominational system. The whole system is utterly and pathetically inadequate to meet the needs of to-day." The *Times-Union*, Albany, N. Y., says: "It is frank, honest and unusually readable."

Pages 212 ***Price $2.00***

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY
230 N. FULTON AVENUE
BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

PRINTED IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE

A Real Christian Unity Movement

The Christian Unity League

The Christian Unity Pact, which is the charter of the League, was adopted at the conference at St. George's church, New York, Nov. 13-15, 1929, and reads as follows:

This is an appeal of Christians to Christians

We, Christians of various churches, believing that only in a cooperative and united Christendom can the world be Christianized, deplore a divided Christendom as being opposed to the Spirit of Christ and the needs of the world. We, therefore, desire to express our sympathetic interest in and prayerful attitude toward all conferences, small and large, that are looking toward the reconciliation of the divided Church of Christ.

We acknowledge the equality of all Christians before God and propose to practice this principle as far as possible in all our spiritual fellowships. We will strive to bring the laws and practices of our several communions into conformity with this principle, so that no Christian shall be denied membership in any of our churches, nor the privilege of participation in the observance of the Lord's supper, nor any minister be denied freedom to our pulpits by reason of differences in forms of ordination. Irrespective of denominational barriers, we pledge to be brethren one to another in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Savior, whose we are and whom we serve.

Every one who accepts these principles is asked to send in his signature

CONTINUATION COMMITTEE

Rev. Peter Ainslie
Baltimore, Md.
Dr. E. S. Ames
Chicago
Rev. Philip S. Bird
Cleveland, O.
Rev. Robert Bagnell
Harrisburg, Pa.
Rev. Edward Blakney
Pittsburgh, Pa.
Rev. A. Brown Caldwell
Baltimore, Md.
Rev. Edmund B. Chaffee
New York
Geo. W. Coleman
Babson Park, Mass.
W. K. Cooper
Washington, D. C.
Rev. W. Steuart Cramer
Lancaster, Pa.
Rev. Lloyd C. Douglas
Montreal, Canada
Dr. W. H. P. Faunce
Providence, R. I.
President Milton G. Evans
Chester, Pa.
Rev. John Ray Ewers
Pittsburgh, Pa.
Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick
New York
Rev. W. H. Foulkes
Newark, N. J.
Dean Charles W. Gilkey
Chicago
President W. A. Harper
Elon College, N. C.
Dr. L. O. Hartman
Boston, Mass.
President John Grier Hibben
Princeton, N. J.
W. H. Hoover
North Canton, O.

Rev. Paul E. Holdcraft
Hagerstown, Md.
President Hamilton Holt
Winter Park, Fla.
Rev. Lynn Harold Hough
Montreal, Canada
Rev. Hugh L. Hodge
Baltimore, Md.
Henry S. Huntington
Scarsdale, N. Y.
Rev. Finis S. Idleman
New York
Dean A. J. James
Evanston, Ill.
Rev. W. Beatty Jennings
Philadelphia, Pa.
Rev. M. Ashby Jones
St. Louis, Mo.
Dr. Rufus M. Jones
Haverford, Pa.
Rev. Hugh T. Kerr
Pittsburgh, Pa.
Rev. Paul E. Linebach
Philadelphia, Pa.
Bishop Francis J. McConnell
New York
Rev. John Howard Melish
Brooklyn, N. Y.
Rev. T. Albert Moore
Toronto, Canada
Dr. C. C. Morrison
Chicago
Rev. W. L. Mudge
Harrisburg, Pa.
Rev. J. A. MacCallum
Philadelphia, Pa.
Dr. Reinhold Neibuhr
New York
Rev. Robert Norwood
New York
Rev. Thomas F. Opie
Burlington, N. C.

Bishop Edward L. Parsons
San Francisco, Calif.
Dr. Francis G. Peabody
Cambridge, Mass.
Rev. Harold C. Phillips
Cleveland, O.
Rev. Richard C. Raines
Providence, R. I.
President H. L. Reed
Auburn, N. Y.
Rev. Karl Reiland
New York
President G. W. Richards
Lancaster, Pa.
Rev. Ivan Murray Rose
Philadelphia, Pa.
Dr. Frank K. Sanders
Rockfort, Mass.
Dr. J. M. Shaw
Kingston, Canada
Dr. Guy Emery Shipler
New York
Rev. Ralph W. Sockman
New York
Rev. Norris L. Tibbetts
Chicago
Rev. Ernest F. Tittle
Evanston, Ill.
Rev. J. S. Ladd Thomas
Philadelphia, Pa.
Rev. Beverley D. Tucker, Jr.
Richmond, Va.
Rev. Morris H. Turk
Portland, Me.
Rev. James I. Vance
Nashville, Tenn.
Dean Robert R. Wicks
Princeton, N. J.
Dr. Herbert L. Willett
Kenilworth, Ill.
Dean Luther A. Weigle
New Haven, Conn.
President Mary L. Woolley
South Hadley, Mass.

And others who have been asked to serve but who have not been heard from.

All inquiries may be addressed to the office of the Continuation Committee of the Christian Unity League, 230 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md.

XIX. No. 4 APRIL, 1930

"God gave unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation"

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

CONTENTS

At the Editor's Desk

How Far the Protestant Episcopal Church Can Go With Protestants . . . . FRANCIS J. HALL

Why I Consider the Protestant Episcopal Church One of the Protestant Group . . . CARL ECKHARDT GRAMMER

Which Is Blind? The Alley or — ? . . . EDWARD L. PARSONS

Ohio Moves Toward Christian Unity . . . . VINTON E. McVICKER

The Pastors' State Convention of the Pennsylvania Council of Churches . . . . WILLIAM L. MUDGE

"All God's Chillun Got Wings" . . . . FRED W. HELFER

What People and Papers Are Saying About Unity

Anglican Modernists and Reunion — A Roman Catholic Newspaper Says the Episcopal Church is Not Catholic — The South Indian Scheme of Union — The United Church of Northern India is Shy of Episcopacy — A Baptist Newspaper Objects to the Christian Unity Pact — The Denominational Disarmament Conference — The Government Calling a Conference for Christian Unity

Letters and Comments

Methodists and Presbyterians Unite — Pentecost and Church Unity — Acceptance of Episcopacy in South India Not Unanimous

Book Reviews

What is Christian Education? — Essentials and Non-Essentials of the Christian Faith — John Wesley Among the Scientists — Christian Reunion in Ecumenical Light—The Case for Episcopacy—Church Union in South India—China Christian Year Book, 1929 — Science and the Unseen World — Religion, Whence and Whither — The Book of Common Prayer — Leaves from the Notebook of a Tamed Cynic

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, Inc.
W. H. HOOVER, President
230 N. FULTON AVE., BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.
AGENTS:
Fleming H. Revell Company, New York
Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai

A Statement

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the Unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are free to all indications of Christian Unity and Ventures of Faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all others who accept Jesus as Lord and Savior — are parts of the Church of Christ and that their Equality before God is the paramount issue of modern times.

Such a journal must, necessarily, be unofficial in its attempt to be an Interpreter of the mind of the churches and in furnishing a Forum for better understanding and cordial appreciation between the divided, and sometimes far isolated, communions of Christendom. It, thereby, seeks to contribute something to clear the way to the Altar of Reconciliation.

It does not hold itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors, except in a very general way as to their character and general attitude; but it invites to its pages such contributions of thought as will, on one hand, help in the removal of misunderstandings, and, on the other, create an atmosphere where our differences may be frankly faced and freely discussed in Christian Fellowship.

All contributors are allowed the same freedom in the expression of their thoughts, as the Editor exercises for himself. He does not anticipate that others will always approve his thoughts, any more than he presumes to assume responsibility for the thoughts of others; but every writer is responsible for what appears above his own name. We are to be free to think and equally free to let think, until, in corporate thinking and corporate praying, we find the Road to Brotherhood.

Consequently, this journal is not only not the organ of any party in Christendom; but, likewise, it is not the exponent of any theory of Christian Unity. It follows the reality in personal experience of spiritual growth in Christ — growing up in Him and toward other Christians as we find the Truth, which shall free us from suspicion, prejudice, pride, and unlove. Then we shall be able to interpret Christ in those terms which He expressed in His own words,—"By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have Love one to another."

CONTENTS

APRIL, 1930

VOL. XIX. NO. 4.

AT THE EDITOR'S DESK 291

HOW FAR THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH CAN GO WITH PROTESTANTS .... FRANCIS J. HALL 301

WHY I CONSIDER THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH ONE OF THE PROTESTANT GROUP. CARL ECKHARDT GRAMMER 310

WHICH IS BLIND? THE ALLEY OR —? .... EDWARD L. PARSONS 315

OHIO MOVES TOWARD CHRISTIAN UNITY .... VINTON E. McVICKER 323

THE PASTORS' STATE CONVENTION OF THE PENNSYLVANIA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES .... WILLIAM L. MUDGE 332

"ALL GOD'S CHILLUN GOT WINGS". FRED W. HELFER 341

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY 345

LETTERS AND COMMENTS 368

BOOK REVIEWS 373

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XIX 379

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY
230 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES:—THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is open to contributions from all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all other Christians who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour. It is entirely immaterial whether these contributions agree or disagree with the Editor's position, or the position of any contributor. We are seeking to bring together those who differ, for unless we frankly face our differences, and think them through, we shall never agree. THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY welcomes to its Forum all Ministers of Reconciliation.

PRICE:—The price of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, published in January, April, July, and October, is seventy-five cents a single copy, or two dollars and fifty cents a year, in the United States and all parts of the world. A local church of any communion contributing annually $5.00 or more to THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY EXTENSION FUND will be entitled to receive two copies of THE QUARTERLY free for one year—one copy going to the minister and the other copy to some designated person or institution.

Entered as second-class matter October 18th, 1923, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., U.S.A., under the Act of Congress of March 3rd, 1879.

The Christian Union Quarterly

EDITOR

Peter Ainslie, D.D., Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Beverley D. Tucker, Jr., D. D., Rector St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, Richmond, Va.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Dr. Hamilcar Alivisatos,
Athens, Greece.

Rev. Nehemiah Boynton, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.

Dean Charles R. Brown,
New Haven, Conn.

Prof. William Adams Brown,
New York, N.Y.

Rev. Raymond Calkins, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass.

Bishop James Cannon, Jr.,
Washington, D.C.

Prof. Dr. J. Eugene Choisy,
Geneva, Switzerland.

Rev. S. D. Chown, D.D.,
Toronto, Canada.

Dr. J. A. Cramer,
Utrecht, Holland.

Prof. Dr. Adolf Deissmann,
Berlin, Germany.

Rev. A. W. Fortune, D.D.,
Lexington, Kentucky.

Dean H. E. W. Fosbroke,
New York, N.Y.

Dr. W. E. Garrison,
Chicago, Ill.

Principal Alfred E. Garvie,
London, England.

Most Rev. Metropolitan Germanos,
Thyatira, Asia Minor.

President W. A. Harper,
Elon College, N. C.

Dr. Henry T. Hodgkin,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Rev. Finis S. Idleman, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.

Dean W. R. Inge,
London, England.

Prof. Rufus M. Jones,
Haverford, Pa.

Rev. Samuel McComb, D.D.,
Dresden, Germany.

Bishop Francis J. McConnell,
New York, N. Y.

Bishop William F. McDowell,
Washington, D.C.

Rev. William P. Merrill, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.

Dr. Wilfred Monod,
Paris, France.

Dr. C. C. Morrison,
Chicago, Ill.

Dr. John R. Mott,
New York, N.Y.

Bishop Harald Ostenfeld,
Copenhagen, Denmark.

Bishop Edward L. Parsons,
San Francisco, Calif.

President George W. Richards,
Lancaster, Pa.

Principal W. B. Selbie,
Oxford, England.

Pastor Dr. Friedrich Siegmund-Schultze,
Berlin, Germany.

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
New York, N.Y.

The Archbishop of Upsala,
Upsala, Sweden.

Dr. Henry van Dyke,
Princeton, N. J.

Rev. Joseph A. Vance, D.D.,
Detroit, Mich.

Bishop Boyd Vincent,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Archbishop of York,
York, England.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

APRIL 1930

AT THE EDITOR'S DESK

The Christian Unity League is significantly advancing. It appears to have come at the right time. With little effort there were a thousand signers to the Christian Unity Pact by the time of the New York conference at St. George's church last fall. Since then fully five hundred persons have sent in their signatures. Now the League is beginning a campaign for 10,000 signers to the Pact and, from the way reports are coming in, it looks as though there will be little difficulty in reaching that number. These signatures are coming from all churches, even from such conservative communions as the Lutheran, Southern Baptist, and Roman Catholic. It indicates that the walls of denominationalism are breaking down, breaking down slowly. It is the time for all Christian unity movements to push ahead. While the Christian Unity League is one approach to this problem, we wish there were a thousand Christian unity movements approaching this problem from as many angles. When unity comes it will come by tremendous effort from every possible angle. The divided church is powerfully entrenched in its divisions. It is going to be a long and hard pull to bring unity. It is not going to come by itself. There must be no let up. One has suggested that the League ought not to think of less than 50,000 signers; another said 100,000 and still another said there was enough challenge in the Christian Unity Pact to think of not less than 500,000. But for the present the League is going to secure 10,000 signers. All who read these lines are requested to send for literature to the Continuation Committee at 230 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md.

Every communion thinks that it is right, usually that it is infallibly right, and all others, of course, are wrong. An educated brother in one of these communions wrote us recently that he would die before he would yield a single point for the sake of unity. He said that to yield a point in the doctrines and practices of his communion would be disloyal to Christ and the fathers who laid the foundation of that communion. No, sir, never! This brother is not by himself, but he is on the losing side. Conscientious loyalty may be a beautiful thing or it may be hateful. Christianity must become a united brotherhood or disintegrate. It cannot continue indefinitely in the abnormal state of a divided house. A distinguished prelate wrote us, in somewhat indignation, that we had intimated the possibility of the disappearance of Christianity from the earth in consequence of its divisions, and quoted the promise that the gates of hell shall not prevail against the church. We reminded him that the same Jesus said a house divided against itself cannot stand. The church has been severely divided against itself for centuries. Jesus presumed that his followers would live somewhat decently together, but we have preferred our 215 varieties of infallible positions to adventuring into Christian brotherhood. If there were no indications to-day of breaking away from these infallible positions, the outlook would be hopeless. Both Jesus and the cross might as well be buried beyond resurrection. But there is an insurrection going on in the whole church. There are thousands and thousands of Christians in the various communions who know better and who are not afraid to adventure in brotherhood for the sake of Jesus and the brotherhood of his divided house. Keep everything you have — your forms, your ceremonies, your creeds, your traditions; but, for the sake of Jesus, be decent and practice brotherhood with all who follow him.

Another member of our editorial council has passed from us. Most Rev. Charles P. Anderson of Chicago had been a voice for a united Christendom through the years. His death came suddenly although he had not been well for some time. He was a fine soul. On the organizing of the World Conference on Faith and Order he was a member of the deputation that visited the continental churches of Europe. The experience of his deputation with the pope was far from satisfactory aside from the pope's declining to have anything to do with the conference. It always seemed to us that after that experience Bishop Anderson was never as enthusiastic in the cause of a united Christendom. Our surprise was that he did not recognize that the pope could not do other than he did do. He is the slave of a system. These theological systems are among the scandals of our religion. Bishop Anderson himself was a slave to such a system — less strict than the Roman Catholic, but strict enough to hold its members away from full fellowship with other Christians. Nevertheless, Bishop Anderson thought beyond his own communion and served the cause of Christ with enthusiasm.

Our Catholic brethren had a special day last month for prayers for the persecuted in Russia. It is always a worthy cause to pray for the persecuted. At the same time the first book that came from the press of Vatican city gave a list of books that Catholics must not read. Among these was the Anglican Book of Common Prayer. The archbishop of Canterbury concurred in the order issued by the pope for prayers for persecuted in Russia, and he called upon the Anglicans to observe the same day. The British government, however, issued an order against the chaplains in the army and navy and air service using the Anglican prayers for the persecuted Russians. The Soviet Russian church issued an order for prayers on the same day that the Lord would not hear the prayers of the Catholics and the Anglicans, inasmuch as Russia could look after its affairs without the prayers of foreigners. The Catholics put a discount on the Anglican prayers, forbidding their members to read them, and incidentally for the Lord not to hear them, while the Russians put a discount both on Catholic and Anglican prayers, petitioning the Lord not to hear them, and the British government put a prohibition on the Anglican prayers. The most absurd and unthinkable condition is to have chaplains in army and navy and air service, and directed by their respective governments as to how to pray. What a mix-up! The church has sold out for a song. Catholics and Anglicans are not on speaking terms; Catholics and Anglicans and Soviet Russians are not on speaking terms. Nothing more ridiculous transpired in the Middle Ages or among the non-Christian religions of the world. It looks as though these brethren should make some effort to find an understanding among themselves before attempting to establish prayer in a common cause. These are the indications of decay in organized Christianity. So far as we have been able to learn, these brethren went through with their prayers, except in the instance of the British prohibition, in the pride and pomp of special favoritism at the divine court, forgetful of humility and the sins of their own churches. It is still a question which of these got by. But there is no question that such a performance augmented immensely the army of unbelievers. In the midst of the great tragedy in Russia how much better for the pope to have invited the archbishop of Canterbury or the archbishop of Canterbury to have invited the pope and both to have invited the patriarch of Constantinople and a Baptist pastor and others to join them in Vatican city or Lambeth palace or somewhere in a joint prayer service for this great cause. Impossible, says some one. Yes, impossible, because organized Christianity abides in the prison house of sectarianism. But something like this has got to be done if Christianity is to be rescued from its imprisonment.

An interesting criticism comes to us affirming that every church has a right to decide who shall come into its membership, who shall partake of the Lord's supper at its service, and whether one of another church shall preach in its pulpit. That is what a divided church does. Every one of these churches think they have rights to build fences around the church, around the Lord's supper and around their pulpit. But they have no such rights if the church is the Lord's. He sacrificed everything for brotherhood. That is what the cross means. There is not a single denominational fence that can stand before the cross of Jesus. The cross is brotherhood, purchased at the highest price of anything that is bought in the world. Not by baptism, not by confirmation, not by episcopacy, not by papacy, not by creed, but by love shall one be known as a disciple of Jesus. All these other tests are easy. In fact, one may accept any of them by being a tenth rate Christian, if Christian at all. But not so with love — love that forgives every injury, love that suffers for the brotherhood of all, love that got its strength and hope and life at the cross. That is the costly thing and Jesus showed us its costliness.

The one state in the United States that leads all others in understanding among Christians is Ohio. It is one of the great states of the union and distinguished for many things, but that which gives it the first place of honor among all other states is the work that is being done by the Ohio Council of Churches under the leadership of Dr. B. F. Lamb. Hundreds of ministers and hundreds of laymen came together in Columbus in January and made one of the most far-reaching contributions to Christian unity that has occurred in this country. There was a freedom in the meetings; there was an earnestness and a hopefulness, that indicated multitudes of people in that state have been thinking in terms of Christian coöperation and unity far beyond such a group that might be gotten together in any other state. Pennsylvania is a close second with Massachusetts following. We wish there were such organized Protestant forces in every state in the union. These states have gone too far to go back; they must go forward.

The Disciples of Kansas City, Mo., have recently made a record in fence building. Dr. Burris Jenkins is minister of the Linwood Christian church in that city. For some years that church has practiced open membership. Recently they decided to call their church "Community church" with their denominational name in brackets. But the Disciple brethren did not like that, so they reorganized their city missionary society and left Dr. Jenkins and his church outside. In rewriting the constitution of their missionary society they made the fence so high and so tight that no open membership church or community church need think they can get in. The Kansas City Disciples have done themselves and the Disciples generally great injury by this action. The children of those who did this will undo it. But it is a pity that a communion that has no apology for its place among the communions of the world other than it started to be a voice for a united church, should abandon its Christian unity idealism in these days when there are so many voices in other communions pleading for a united Christendom, unless the Kansas City Disciples mean that there is no Christian unity from their point of view except all other communions come to the standard set up by the new constitution of their reorganized missionary society. It is possible that this is what they mean. Uniformity is passing and diversity in unity is coming in.

The Lambeth conference will be held in July at Lambeth palace. All the bishops of the Anglican communion, including the Protestant Episcopal church, will be in attendance. It will be a body of distinguished men. Among them are some prophets. One of the subjects which they will discuss is the unity of Christendom. This has always been a foremost subject with Anglicans and Episcopalians. They have had to move cautiously as all communions must do. This is particularly true of the Anglican communion because of its Protestant and Anglo-Catholic elements. It has been remarkable that these two elements have held together so completely through the years. It is a lesson in the possibility of combining these elements in the united church of the future. But Christian unity is further advanced now than at any time in the history of the world. Lambeth has helped in this advance. These two facts will contribute toward making the July conference more important and more difficult than any conference that has been held in the history of Lambeth. This conference must not be afraid to take a position that will put the entire Anglican communion on a more Christian basis with Protestants. At this time there is little, if any, possibility of dealing with Rome. That will not come until Protestant unity has been achieved. But Protestantism is now a ripe field for Anglican approach. That approach will amount to little unless it is on the basis of the equality of these two groups before God. All other approaches will be in the polite language of political diplomacy and will get us nowhere. If Protestantism in the United States unites and the Episcopal church is left out by its own choice as it was in the union in Canada, it will be unfortunate for the Anglican communion, because Protestant union will be formed around the world and the Anglicans will have no escape except to go to Rome in absolute submission as 8,000 or more Anglicans are now doing every year, according to Catholic authorities. That may be all right, of course, but we believe that the Anglican communion has its obligation to Protestantism at this period in the process toward a united Christendom. We await the message from Lambeth palace with keen interest. We are trying to be hopeful.

The eyes of the world are on India. That great nation is rising out of a long sleep. Whether dominion status or independence is a possible achievement at this time has awakened the interest of the world. Mahatma Ghandi is to multitudes the greatest character in the world, surpassing that of any Christian prelate or statesman. If the British government is strong enough and wise enough it will grant dominion status, which India deserves, if they cannot have independence. But Christians in India are likewise attracting the attention of the world. The United church of Northern India is shy of episcopacy; the United church of Southern India appears to favor episcopacy. If Lambeth conference advises the Anglican episcopacy to go into the South India union it will be a new chapter in episcopacy. But has the time not come to write a new chapter in episcopacy as well as in other forms of church polity? Is the Anglican communion strong enough and wise enough to do this in its field as the British government may do in the field of politics toward the rising desire for a new governmental relation toward England?

We expected some move to be made for the establishment of a permanent memorial to Bishop Charles H. Brent and we are gratified that plans have been completed to this end. It is a beautiful and deserved tribute to a great leader in the cause of a united Christendom. In his leadership of the World Conference on Faith and Order he would have carried the Lausanne conference further than it went if it had been possible to have done so. He had already gone beyond the Protestant Episcopal church in his yearnings and fellowships, as any man must do in his communion who gives himself to the cause of a united Christendom, and frequently he was lonely in his own communion; but he plodded ahead with a spirit and a fidelity that made a contribution to unity that a fund of a million dollars will not be able to express. It is earnestly hoped, however, that this amount will be raised, which is to be used as follows: (1) To further Christian unity by gifts to the budget of the permanent secretariat of the World Conference on Faith and Order, a cause for which the bishop labored so effectively. (2) To aid in carrying on Bishop Brent's unfinished work in the Philippine Islands: (a) The Moro school work at Jolo. (b) The assistance of other institutions established by Bishop Brent in the islands, such as St. Luke's hospital, the cathedral and Brent school. (3) To coöperate with the bishop's successors in his last diocese of Western New York in assisting in time of need when funds permit, any unfinished special project of Bishop Brent. The headquarters for the fund is at 6 East Forty-first Street, New York, and Curtis J. Mar is the secretary. The board of trustees is made up of twenty-five friends of the bishop as follows: Mrs. Robert Bacon, Mrs. Stephen Baker, Edward D. Brandegee, Mrs. W. Bayard Cutting, the Rev. Samuel S. Drury,

Gano Dunn, Rt. Rev. David L. Ferris, Hon. W. Cameron Forbes, Hon. Alanson B. Houghton, Mrs. Helen Hartley Jenkins, Mrs. John Markoe, Samuel Mather, Charles F. R. Ogilby, Rev. Remsen B. Ogilby, Hon. George Wharton Pepper, General John J. Pershing, Mrs. Nathaniel Bowditch Potter, Blanchard Randall, Mrs. Whitelaw Reid, General William C. Rivers, Harper Sibley, Mrs. C. Lorillard Spencer, Lorillard Spencer, Mrs. Leonard Wood, and Mrs. A. Murray Young. It is a worthy cause and we heartily commend it to our readers in all parts of the world.

We are glad to note that the Christian Herald Institute will hold another conference at Buck Hill Falls next month. They have invited a hundred and fifty persons to meet there for several days to discuss the problems of Christian unity. The meeting there last year was worth while; this year it ought to be still better. The oftener Christians of different communions meet together the better it is for understanding and coöperation. We wish there could be a dozen such meetings this year. We hope the time is not far distant when meetings such as this will spring up all over the country. It does not matter whether they are independent or auxiliaries of movements already established. The main thing is that people meet together and discuss this problem. Nobody has a copyright on the absolute way toward unity. But when multitudes of people make it their private opinion that it ought to be, it will be.

It is important to remember that all Christians believe in God, in Jesus Christ, in the holy Spirit, and in the Scriptures. Our quarrels are over definitions of these. From the days preceding Nicæa to this time efforts have been made to reduce God, by lofty phrases, to a definition. The same effort has been made to reduce Jesus Christ, the holy Spirit, and the Scriptures to definitions. The arguments for this accomplishment are most plausible. Of course it is much easier to express faith in a definition and to quarrel over it, than it is to live a life of faith and suffer for it.

In the course of the last few weeks we have had four letters calling for certain definite conditions of Christian unity. One contended for the acceptance of the pre-millennial coming of Christ as essential to Christian unity. The second contended for the acceptance of baptism by immersion as the essential thing. The third contended for the ancient creeds, and the fourth for the priesthood. One of the most interesting phases in these discussions was that the writers were entirely oblivious to the fact that those who contended for the pre-millennial coming of Christ, for baptism by immersion, for the ancient creeds, and for the priesthood were most scandalously divided among themselves, many of these parties having no fellowship whatever between each other. When in reply, we contended that in order to present any proposition to the whole church it must at least prove itself workable among those who believe in it and practice it, we did not make the slightest impression, but each held stoutly for these secondary elements as being primary in any discussion on Christian unity. We were perfectly willing for any one of these to hold to what he believed, provided he did not disfellowship those who dissented from any one of these positions. Christian unity cannot come on the pre-millennial nor the post-millennial position; it cannot come on baptism by immersion nor on baptism by sprinkling or pouring; it cannot come on ancient creeds or modern creeds; it cannot come on the priesthood nor the ministry of any kind, clerical or lay. Christian unity must come on Christ. It is his church that we have divided. It is his church that we are seeking to bind together in one fellowship. Everything is secondary to Christ and his Spirit. "If a man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his." There is no position upon which we should take ugly attitudes against others. If these things for which we are contending produce an ugly state of mind in us, however true they may have been when we espoused them, our ugliness makes them untrue. The rule of the Spirit of Christ in us will make us brethren to all of his brethren.

HOW FAR THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH CAN GO WITH PROTESTANTS

BY REV. FRANCIS J. HALL, D.D.

Formerly Professor of Dogmatic Theology, General Theological Seminary, New York

I GLADLY accept the editor's open-hearted invitation to discuss the subject to which he has given the above title. Whether designedly or not, his phrasing raises the question, Why cannot a church which describes itself as "Protestant" go all the way with Protestants? Therefore, I venture at the outset to explain that the sense in which this church is Protestant is that in which the term was originally adopted at the diet of Spires in the sixteenth century, of *rejection of non-primitive papal claims and corruptions.* To-day it has come to mean rejection of much more — of certain episcopal, sacerdotal, sacramentalist, and other principles of the ancient Catholic system, principles which antedate anything distinctively Roman, and which are still deemed vital by Orthodox Eastern, Old Catholic, and Anglican churches, in spite of their rejection of Roman accretions. A careful comparison of our Prayer Book, on the one side, with the Service Books of the Catholic churches above mentioned, and, on the other side, with Protestant systems will show that, *as terms are now used,* this church belongs to the Catholic rather than the Protestant section of Christendom. A prominent Protestant leader, Dr. Frederick Lynch, has pointed this out in *The Living Church* of December 14, 1929; and I heartily agree with his opinion that we ought to drop the word "Protestant" from our name. It is misleading.

What has been said obviously throws light on the *non possumus* attitude of this church with regard to certain proposals supposed to make for Christian reunion. But the fact remains that it has more points of contact and sympathy with

Protestants than has any other church of the Catholic group, and feels strongly impelled to promote ultimate reunion between Catholics and Protestants. It would be useless to elaborate on this, for it has been widely recognized among Protestants. But Protestants will understand us better if they will bear in mind an obvious consequence of our compromising, or seeming to the Catholic world at large to compromise, integral elements of ancient Catholic system hitherto retained by us. That consequence will be a shifting of this church from the Catholic to the Protestant section of Christendom, and forfeiture of all hope we may have of promoting the reunion of *Christendom at large.* And this larger reunion is the goal of our efforts, the subject of our prayers, and, therefore, the controlling consideration in our method of working for unity — an educational method at present, rather than one of *negotiation and action* in the direction of reunion with Protestants. From the standpoint above indicated the latter method would be premature, and would greatly delay the consummation of our wider aim.

Coming to the question as to how far we can go with Protestants, I shall consider it in two branches: (*a*) Things in which we can go all the way that circumstances suggest and make possible; (*b*) Things wherein our principles and aim limit our going.

I. In Some Things All the Way.

In general, we can go all the way in all practicable and reasonable courses that do not prejudice or seem to prejudice any integral element of the ancient Catholic system to which this church is committed, and that are consistent with its Anglican affiliations and with its Prayer Book and canon law. The following examples will illustrate my meaning:

(*a*) In *love* and, when divergent policies and misunderstandings arise, in *patient forbearance.* If we are true to our Christian profession, amid all differences of interpretations of its specific requirements, we shall set no limit beyond which we will not go in this direction. And if our manners of showing love in action are found mutually to differ in some regards, then patient forbearance remains to the finish as our duty and privilege. Perhaps my article will by its frankness offer occasion for such forbearance on the part of Protestant readers.

(*b*) As involved in love, yet of distinct bearing, is *sympathy,* the mutual sympathy which ought to control the attitude of followers of the one divine Redeemer, our Lord Jesus Christ. We can have *fellow feeling,* and can try to understand that our differences do not signify insincerity on either side in allegiance to our common Master. To this end we can seek always to interpret the divergent ways of others as grounded in conscientious convictions concerning the Master's will. In brief, we can and ought to go all the way in refusing to judge *personally* those whose methods of Christian allegiance differ from ours in ways which we regard as mistaken.

(*c*) We can also go all the way in *seeking to understand each other in those matters of faith and order wherein we differ;* and it was our anxiety to do this that moved this church to initiate the World Conference movement. I need not dwell on this, except to say that our efforts in this direction do not signify throwing convictions into solution. They are intended to open up fresh and coöperative study of differences; and presuppose the necessity of removing certain of them before actual steps toward reunion can become practical politics. The direction, then, in which we can go all the way with Protestants in the interest of reunion is educational rather than schematic.

We cannot rightly claim to have done all that we can by God's grace in traveling with Protestants the way of love, sympathy and understanding, above described; and any assumption on our part of superiority to Protestants in these regards would be most presumptious. I would contend, however, that we acknowledge our shortcomings, and that our movement for unity is not less sincere because less rapid in method than some of our Protestant co-workers in the cause think desirable.

II. In Other Things, How Far?

This brings us to consider the things in which we cannot go all the way with Protestants — the things wherein the question, "How far?" has the pertinence undoubtedly intended when the title of this article was chosen for me. If we could go all the way with Protestants in every religious line of action, no such question could arise, except as implying an accusation of perversity — surely not intended by the good editor. The question, as I take it, is meant to draw out a clear indication of the limits beyond which the Episcopal church cannot go in certain lines of co-action with Protestants, and of the reasons which account for these limits.

In fundamental aspect every specific example of these limits is due to the Catholic standpoint of this church, and to the consequent fact that the differences in faith and order between us and Protestants involve consequent oppositions of conviction as to the harmony of certain practical policies with the abiding arrangements of Christ and his holy Spirit for his church. With these preliminaries I come to more specific statements.

(*a*) The first limit of our unity action is that we feel obliged to act in accord with the general premise set forth by our house of bishops in 1886, when they declared that Christian unity can be restored only by "the return of all Christian communions to the principles of unity exemplified by the undivided Catholic church during the first ages of its existence; which principles we believe to be the substantial deposit of Christian faith and order committed by Christ and his apostles to the church unto the end of the world, and, therefore, incapable of compromise or surrender by those who have been ordained to be its stewards and trustees for the common and equal benefit of all men." And three things need to be said with regard to the four articles, the so called quadrilateral, appended to this declaration: (i) They are not offered as terms, the acceptance of which commits us forthwith to action, but are didactic, terms being left to future agreement; (ii) they are not exhaustive, but indicate suitable particulars for *preliminary* consideration; (iii) the "historic episcopate," and the other three articles, are described as *"inherent parts* of this sacred deposit and, therefore, essential to the restoration of unity."

Accordingly, our most fundamental limit in going with Protestants is that we can do nothing that will seem to compromise our adherence to things deemed of divine prescription by the ancient and undivided Catholic church. This obviously commits us to *safeguarding sacerdotal and sacramentalist principles,* as distinguished, of course, from objectionable mediæval enlargements and corruptions of them. Our unity work includes *promotion instead of compromise* of these principles, as being essential to world-wide unity.

(*b*) The second limit is our consciousness of the futility of promoting unity by methods which weaken and imperil the existing unity of the great Anglican communion, a unity to the maintenance of which this church is expressly committed in its Prayer Book. It is an important branch of this limitation that lines of individual or group action which alarm many loyal souls, and seem to them to be contrary to Prayer Book prescriptions and our canon law, in our judgment, are abortive "flickering expedients" — abortive because destructive of the internal harmony upon which success depends in Episcopal work for unity.

Our Protestant friends hardly realize the influence of our Prayer Book in determining the attitude of our loyal people at large toward proposals which seem inconsistent with it. Protestant formularies, where such have been adopted, do not enter directly into the normal lives of the laity as does our Prayer Book. Its chief services, Catholic in form and implied doctrine, are used every Sunday by the faithful; and have no rival of equal sanction, in forming individual outlooks. Accordingly, extending far beyond the so called Anglo-Catholic group, is a large central body of churchmen who are disturbed by anything which seems to be inconsistent with the working system and its teaching to which they are habituated. Protestants exaggerate greatly the representative value of "liberal" utterances and actions. It is the Prayer Book that counts *abidingly* in determining the general sentiments of the devout in the Episcopal church, the sentiments which in final issue determine how far this church can go. The sentiments of floaters, the indifferent and careless, are negligible in this matter.

III. Specific Examples.

(*a*) This church cannot officially recognize the validity of Protestant ministries; although it refrains also from any direct declaration of their invalidity, confining itself to insistence upon episcopal ordination for the ministry which it accepts. That Protestant ministries have been blessed of God, and that, within their self-avowed functional limits (I refer to their being professedly non-sacerdotal), they have been spiritually fruitful, is freely acknowledged among us. But the Protestant argument that this acknowledgment of fruitfulness ought to be accompanied by recognition of "validity" is based upon misunderstanding of what this and other Catholic churches mean by "validity." They mean conformity to Christ's ministerial arrangements for his universal church. Christ will bless all who try to serve him, even when they mistake his arrangements; and Protestants are not guilty of *wittingly* departing from them. So their ministries are both real and Christian. But, if the pertinent Catholic doctrine to which this church is committed is true, they are other than — lack the *authority* of — that divinely appointed episcopal and sacerdotal ministry of the Catholic church which this church can alone recognize as authentically "valid." If the doctrine mentioned is true, non-episcopal ministries having fruitfully served providential purposes under the circumstances of a divided Christendom, should give way in reunited Christendom to its original Catholic ministry.

(*b*) As committed to the doctrine above stated, the Episcopal church cannot compromise it by sanctioning practices which imply, or are likely to be regarded as implying, that non-episcopal ministrations can do duty for those of its own episcopal ministers. It can, and under certain conditions does, sanction, subject to the local bishop's previous approval, *special* addresses to its congregations by non-episcopal ministers, but not as giving them the normal or official status of the appointed preaching of its own ministry. Similarly, our ministers can lawfully give special addresses in Protestant churches, under the same limitation of being unofficial. Every form of mutual contact, which does not bear the meaning of exchange of ministries, or of substitution of one for the other, is not only permissible, but in the educational promotion of better understanding may become very desirable indeed. Obviously it is *in normal and official functioning,* whether in regular public worship, in sacramental ministrations, or in pulpit preaching, that the limitation to which I refer emerges. And no minister of this church can disregard it without breach of our canon law.

(*c*) This church cannot sanction communion at its altars by those who *refuse* to be confirmed. The cause lies deeper than Protestants usually realize. It is not merely a matter of discipline; and it is neither an Episcopal nor an Anglican provincialism. According to the ancient doctrine of the universal church, confirmation, at the hands of the church's prescribed minister, is a sacramental means of grace complementary to that of baptism, and is necessary for the full spiritual equipment of a Christian. Because so regarded by all the Catholic churches, refusal to be confirmed, however sincere, and quite independently of denominational considerations, is by them treated as a barrier to communicant privilege. The unconfirmed are indeed permitted in many cases to communicate, but on the explicit assumption that they are "ready and desirous" to be confirmed as soon as opportunity occurs.

(*d*) This brings us to a related, and by many Protestants severely criticized, limit in our going with them. I refer to our inability consistently with our eucharistic doctrine to unite on special occasions with them in acts of corporate communion. To the Catholic church this sacrament is the Christian sacrifice, not as remedying any insufficiency of the sacrifice of the Cross, but as the divinely appointed formal means of our uniting with Christ in its oblation and pleading before the Father, and of appropriating its benefits. In it also the bread and wine after their consecration, which is a central *sine qua non* of the rite, are believed to be the body and blood of Christ, being under that solemn designation offered to God as the memorial appointed by him for us to make. And our consumption of the sacrament thus consecrated is the formal means whereby, if penitent and believing, we obtain the benefits of the sacrament. From such a standpoint we have to regard a corporate communion as highly unreal except as *presupposing* an agreement of doctrine between its participants which is conspicuously wanting between us and Protestants.

Accordingly, we do not dare to celebrate it or participate in it under circumstances that seem openly to throw into solution our convictions concerning this holy mystery, convictions rooted in many centuries of uninterrupted tradition still retained by a vast majority of Christians. We are constrained to regard corporate communion, not as a means of uniting divided Christians, but as presupposing and manifesting the goal of accomplished union. We are glad to unite with Protestants in suitable non-sacramental methods of signalizing our mutual good-will and coöperation in labor for unity. But, to repeat myself, we cannot throw our sacramental doctrine into solution.

(*e*) Finally, strongly as we desire reunion with Protestants, we may not disregard our canon laws and Prayer Book prescriptions in promoting it. If circumstances should seem to call for changes in them, changes that would obviously promote unity *without compromise of principle,* we should be prepared to agitate for their adoption. But while existing enactments remain unchanged, we cannot violate them without internal consequences unfavorable to the cause of unity.

IV. Concluding Observations.

It may, of course, be objected to the position taken in this article that it is not representative of more than that section of the Episcopal church called Anglo-Catholic, of a minority only of its membership. I have elsewhere in this article given reasons for regarding such a conclusion as oblivious of the much larger section of our membership which is loyal to the Prayer Book and very greatly influenced in conviction by habitual use of it.

I have assumed that the most determinative factor in finding what can be done by a church which imposes upon all its members the habitual use for worship of a Prayer Book full of significant teaching and precept is the trend of that teaching. And it is a mistake to suppose that the Prayer Book is an out-of-date survival and no longer seriously to be reckoned with. A clear proof of this is the lively interest with which its revisions of 1892 and 1928 were carried out; and the fact that, so far from its Catholic aspects being thereby reduced, they have been made more clear. The Prayer Book is the living voice of this church; and movements which reveal discontent with its conversatisms, failing as they do to secure their reversal, are not representative of the corporate mind of this church. Such movements come and go, and are tolerated; but after they pass the church's position, officially imposed, remains as before.

I have spoken frankly, believing that mistaken hopes as to what this church may do for unity will surely bring disillusionment, and thereby will set back the cause of unity. With this belief, I regard lack of candor as inconsistent with charity. I plead with my Protestant readers, however, to bear with me, if I have inadvertently used language which is needlessly challenging.

Francis J. Hall.

A PRAYER

Lord of all nations!
Guide thou my footsteps and keep them aright—
Let me have strength from the strength of thy might!
Lord of all men!

Lord of all nations!
Shelter me close in thine own tender keeping;
Let me be thine, whether waking or sleeping;
Lord of all men!

Lord of all nations!
Let me know pity and kindness and love:
When sorrow comes, send thou grace from above;
Lord of all men!

Lord of all nations!
Till shadows lengthen, and earth's friends must part,
Let there be work for my hands and my heart;
Lord of all men!

—*Kathleen N. Long.*

WHY I CONSIDER THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH ONE OF THE PROTESTANT GROUP

BY REV. CARL ECKHARDT GRAMMAR, S. T. D.

Rector of St. Stephen's Church, Philadelphia, and sometime Professor of Church History and Canon Law in the Theological Seminary of Virginia.

A Congregational minister, whose wife is a member and regular attendant, and his sons acolytes, at the pronounced Anglo-Catholic church, St. Mary the Virgin, New York, has written an article in *The Living Church* declaring that in his judgment the Episcopal church does not belong to the Protestant group, and is not rightly named Protestant. The editor of *The Living Church,* delighted with this pronouncement, is circulating the article in pamphlet form and announces that he intends to start a movement to change the church's name.

It is but natural that an Anglo-Catholic should take this view. He has long chafed under the official name of the Episcopal church. And it is not surprising that a Congregational minister, who often worships at St. Mary's, should adopt the Anglo-Catholic view of the Episcopal church. There are, however, many solid reasons that justify the official title, and explain the participation of Episcopalians in Protestant conferences. It may be well to summarize them.

First of all, "Protestant Episcopal" is the title that was adopted when the congregations of the church of England in these colonies were organized, at the end of the Revolution.

Second, the mother church of England, from which the Protestant Episcopal church declares that it is "far from intending to depart in any essential point of doctrine, discipline or worship," is Protestant. This is clearly seen not only in the articles which the English clergy have to subscribe for their general sense, but also in the homilies and in the teaching of the devotional services, and more particularly in the catechism.

Perhaps no better testimony can be cited than the dying confession of the great high churchman, Archbishop Laud: "I desire it may be remembered, I have always lived in the Protestant religion established in England, and in that I come now to die." Here is the judgment of the standard history of the church of England by Patterson, certainly not a low churchman, page 289 (new impression, 1929): "The Elizabethan settlement was both Catholic and Protestant. It was Catholic because it was based on the Bible and the usages of the primitive church. The reformers rightly maintained that mediæval accretions could not be Catholic because they were unknown to the primitive church. The settlement was Protestant, not only because it rejected the papal claims, but also because it rejected those doctrines and points of church order which were characteristically mediæval."

Third, the Protestant Episcopal church bears the distinguishing marks of a Protestant church:

(1) Its exaltation of the Bible over tradition as the supreme source of our knowledge of Christianity.

(2) Its elevation of private judgment as seen in its official dropping of the confessional and leaving its members to the guidance of their own consciences.

(3) Its use of the vulgar tongue in worship and its wide circulation of the Bible in the vernacular.

(4) Its married clergy.

(5) Its rejection of the pope, purgatory, pardons, worshipping and adoration of images as well as relics, and also invocation of saints.

(6) The large share that it gives the laity in the legislation of the church and in the affairs of the parish. In this respect the Episcopal church excels many churches that consider themselves leaders in Protestantism.

(7) Its hymnology, which differs but little from the hymnology of other Protestants.

(8) Its communion office, which knows nothing of transubstantiation, and was declared by a papal commission to be clearly Protestant, and so plainly not an offering of an unbloody

sacrifice that those ordained to celebrate it could not be regarded by the Roman Catholic church as priests in the Catholic sense.

(9) The Reformation doctrine — justification by faith, which is technically stated in the XIth article, is implied in the prayers, confessions and forms of absolution and bears its logical fruit in the dropping of penances.

(10) While the word priest is found in the Prayer Book, it is the synonym of presbyter in the canons as it is etymologically only "presbyter writ small," to parody Milton. While the Anglo-Catholics use it as equivalent to *"sacerdos"* or *"hiereus"* of the New Testament, the Reformers were quite aware that the sacerdotal character belongs to all Christians and that it is never ascribed especially to the ministry in the New Testament.

(11) There are a few Romish phrases left in the Prayer Book in the minor offices, but the general tone and spirit of the Prayer Book is strongly Protestant. The Anglo-Catholics prove this by their frequent departures from it and additions to it.

(12) The sacerdotal form of absolution in the visitation of the sick in the English book, which is cited as a proof of its sacerdotal teaching, is, I admit, a Romish survival, but it is significant that the absolution is not contained in the American book.

But (to take up some objection) it is urged against our Protestantism that we are not brotherly and do not admit other Protestant ministers to our pulpits. My answer is that we admit them when they are invited by the proper authority. No church allows anyone to climb into its pulpit without due authority. The trouble with us is that this authority to invite outsiders to officiate in our congregations is restricted to the bishop. I wish that discretion were left to every rector. Then we should probably be more like other churches in this respect. In Massachusetts Bishop Lawrence left the matter entirely in the discretion of the rectors. That was as liberal as the policy of any church.

But, it is objected, we do not allow other ministers to join in celebrating the Lord's supper. Personally I wish that this discretion also were left to the rectors, but surely illiberality with regard to participation in the Lord's supper does not exclude a church from the Protestant group, else the Baptists must be excluded also.

As for the so-called "high doctrine" of the Lord's supper, which many of our members hold, this is not the official teaching of the church, though it is a permitted belief. But if it were our official belief it ought not to exclude us from the Protestant fold as long as that group contains Lutherans and the followers of Dr. Nevin in the Reformed church.

But, it is further argued, the Protestant churches date their origin from the Reformation, and the Protestant Episcopal church claims to run back to apostolic times and is, therefore, not entitled to be called a Protestant or Reformation church. But many Protestants claim a similarly ancient lineage. "The ministry of the church in which I serve has as unbroken a tradition, reaching back to the earliest age, as any church in Christendom," wrote Dr. Coffin recently. Yet the Presbyterians are surely Protestants. The church of England existed before the Reformation just as Virginia existed before the Declaration of Independence. But the church of England, as a separate organization and in its present form, began at the Reformation just as the Protestant Episcopal church began after the colonies achieved independence, and as our national government began then. It is a metaphysical question wherein identity consists in an organization whose members are constantly changing. The great majority of the English people were in the national church, both before and after the Reformation. If that constitutes identity, then the churches were the same. This was the legal view and the Reformed national church held on to its property. If a new relation to the outside world constitutes a new organization regardless of the fact that the people may be the same, as at the achievement of our independence when the colonies set up a new government, then the church of England was a new church at the Reformation.

Bishop Shibbs held the first view, and John Richard Green the second. All depends on what constitutes identity. It is sufficient to say that for centuries after the Reformation the English church considered itself as both Catholic and Reformed. It was the old church of the English people and also a new church with a reformed doctrine, discipline and worship. In the same way, the Protestant Episcopal church is the historic church of the English-speaking people, and also a truly American church organized as a result of national independence.

I see no reason why the Protestant churches should accept the Anglo-Catholic view of the Protestant Episcopal church when it has had such a Protestant tradition and is so closely assimilated in teaching, in moral ideals, and in its love of liberty and democracy with the Protestant churches of our land. It has been this church's endeavor to be comprehensive and to be a hospitable home for many types. Let us be judged not by one type, nor by the conduct of one bishop, but by our history, standards, and general spirit.

CARL ECKHARDT GRAMMER.

THE LIVING BLEND

Life is too large for all our creedal moods
And will not let our little dikes prevail
Too utterly against the boisterous gale,
The overwhelmings of the ocean floods.
The vast involvements of our daily goods
Laugh at the narrow confines of the pale,
And shop and market, throttle, wheel, and sail
Gather their own from all our broken broods.
In vain do we essay to love by rule,
Or hold our hatreds rigidly aloof,
Our faiths and virtues righteously immune:
The wise man still is father to the fool,
The common sickness seeps through every roof,
And all life comrades all life late or soon.

—*Robert Whitaker.*

WHICH IS BLIND? THE ALLEY OR—?

BY RT. REV. EDWARD L. PARSONS, D.D.
Protestant Episcopal Bishop, San Francisco, California

THE interesting and striking papers which Dr. Barton contributed recently to *The Christian Century* on "Lausanne's Blind Alley" and "Last Day at Lausanne" have received a reply directly from Sir Henry Lunn and Dr. Cadman in *The Christian Century* itself, but the whole matter which he opens is so worth while that, perhaps, even at this late date it is not too late to make some further comment which will reach a large group of those who are deeply interested in the movement toward unity.

Of course Dr. Barton's papers are interesting. They are excellent journalism, full of personalities, with just that suggestion of widespread human frailty which makes best sellers out of the new school biographies. Ludwig nor Maurois nor Strachey could be more entertaining. But although on a second reading one realizes that the papers are serious and there is a real and definite purpose, one misses the fine and generous charity and tolerance which one looks for in the expositor of Lincoln's faith.

Dr. Barton is quite right in his satisfaction that the original program of the Subjects Committee was scrapped; but my impression is that without the work of that committee as a basis, many of the groups would have found it almost impossibly hard to frame their tentative reports. I am sorry that he has not read the official report of the Conference. A careful reading and fair mastery of that book upon the part of our American delegates would go far toward making Archbishop D'Arcy's fling that the Americans were so ignorant quite pointless. The fact is that while delegates from other countries were in large proportion scholars, the American delegates were administrative officers, pastors, and the like — practical men. That was certainly true of our American Episcopal delegation. We had Bishop Brent and two well known theologians; but the great scholars who led the church of England delegation must have realized that the rest of us were not in their class. "The rest of us" certainly did. All of which simply means that for the purposes of such a conference our distinctive American gifts do not come first. It is very hard for us with our passion for speed and for efficiency to enter wholeheartedly into a program which means only study and which contemplates results as necessarily slow in ripening. Wherever in America there has been disappointment with the Conference it has been largely due, so far as I have read, to its failure to get somewhere with quick efficiency.

But it was not called with that purpose. Its members were not there to negotiate. They had no plenipotentiary powers. They were, as I have written and said a hundred times, a fact finding body. They were asked to make a kind of map of the ecclesiastico-theological world in order that we might see where we are; and that all our communions, together and in a way authoritative if not official, might envisage the points to which our thinking and, later, our negotiations must be directed. Suppose we had tried "in the leadership of the Spirit of God a living power, interested in present day progress" to write a new chapter in the history of the church. I am side by side with Dr. Barton in believing that the holy Spirit lives and works to-day where men will surrender themselves to that leadership. But what would have happened? Suppose that the Congregationalists had said, "We will accept episcopal ordination," and the Orthodox had said, "We will consider the seven General Councils scrapped," and the Anglicans had stretched out their hands to both and said, "God bless you. You are good Anglicans now" (which would be quite true for Anglicans have no theory of the episcopate and their final appeal is to Scripture). Suppose all this had happened, what else would have happened? No delegation had power to bind its communion. Every delegation would have gone home and found a constituency quite as unyielding as Wilson found the Senate. In 1435 at Florence the East and the West came together and the delegates thought they had healed the schism. But they had not. The home constituency in the "Orthodox" lands had to be heard from. The Orthodox delegation at Lausanne remembered that. Their declaration was unquestionably as much for their constituencies at home as for the Conference, which by the way they did not leave and have continued ever since to treat with enthusiastic interest and approval. The Conference was not called to negotiate unity. It must be judged by what it was asked to do and did, not by what it might have done.

Again take the common Communion service. If we, who for ourselves have no hesitation about receiving Communion in any Christian body nor any about administering it to whomsoever may desire, keep on asserting that any other attitude is unchristian, it seems to me clear that our attitude is quite as narrow and quite as intolerant as that of the Orthodox or the Anglo-Catholic or the close communion Baptist. We fault them for their exclusiveness, their frankness in saying, "You must come my way," and then we turn in and say exactly the same thing. The essence of the Conference method is that of mutual respect, of the recognition of the approach to unity as a common coöperative task in which as Christians we stand equal before the Lord.

It strikes me that the picture of the "bewildered Orientals" is rather overdrawn. I think a few were bewildered by business methods quite unfamiliar to them, but they certainly gave all of us an example of the finest Christian spirit. They believe absolutely in their own views. They have been brought up to dread Protestantism. In the Near East they have had to see Protestants coming to convert their people as if they were pagans. Some of them are no doubt still pretty doubtful of even Anglican orders. But they come; they stay; they take part; they make a real contribution. No one in the group which discussed "the church" under the leadership of Professor Alivisatos could question his Christian spirit, nor his knowledge of what is going on in the Christian world to-day. But how could they take part in a common Communion service? That, from their point of view must be the end, not the beginning. The American Protestant asserts that Christ would not approve. The Orthodox are sure that their way is the way Christ would have his church go. The need of the Conference arises at precisely that point. The question "Who is Christian?" in this matter does not and ought not to arise. Both are Christian when they agree to respect and to study each other's views and to treat each other as equals before God in conference, and to try together to find the mind of Christ. But contempt or sweeping condemnation of the man who is ready to accept you as a Christian brother or the church which is willing to confer with yours on an equality can hardy find a place among the Christian virtues.

I should like to say, by the way, that I don't believe any one ever had to smoke Bishop Brent out on a matter like the common Communion service. It would be natural for him as a gentleman to raise no issue when people asked him whether he had attended. He would certainly have never concealed his convictions if any one wanted to know them. But I think he must have said that it was his own views, not the law of his church, which prevented his attendance. There is a definite tradition against such attendance; but there is no law. The Episcopal clergy who received Communion at the Christian Unity League's service at Union Theological Seminary, New York, were entirely within their rights.

It is just in the same spirit of mutual respect and equality that we Americans must realize that we cannot bring the Christian world to our pragmatic attitude toward doctrine over night. It is not only the Orthodox or the Anglo-Catholic who feel the supreme importance of thorough doctrinal study. The Swedes, the Germans, the Lutherans in other than German lands, the Scotch Presbyterians, indeed pretty much the whole Christian world outside America does believe that a careful study and understanding of doctrine is necessary; that there must be found in some way a position in regard to doctrine which will integrate or synthesize the various types of Christian thinking. There is no use in our waiving such convictions aside. They won't be waived. If the Christian world is to be united it will be only as the Christian communions find some positive principle by which they can work their way through the doctrinal maze with intelligence and mutual understanding. I believe that that principle will be found in what is essentially a pragmatic position like or, perhaps, identical with what Dr. Barton would desire, unity in the fabric of church life with the recognition of diversity in worship and of varying interpretations in doctrine. Such an end could be achieved at once if we were all carried away by a real passion for it and an understanding of one another large enough to be tolerant. In the meanwhile we must do all in our power to create the *good-will* to unity, to arouse the dormant conscience of Christians, to open the hearts of men that the spirit of God may enter and guide.

And that brings me to the question as yet untouched. All that I have said about the Conference may be true but in its conception, in its ideal and in its achievement was it not futile even if it were not a failure? I answer unhesitatingly no!

If unity is in accordance with the mind of Christ, if it is in other words worth while, then whatever stimulates interest on the part of Christian people is also worth while. I have already noted that we cannot put to one side doctrinal questions, however unimportant they may seem to our American minds. They are real questions in a great part of Christendom. Some answer must be given if unity is to be more than the uniting of American Protestantism.

The Lausanne Conference reports were referred to the churches which sent delegates to the Conference with the request that they be studied and commented upon. They have certainly served that purpose. The record of churches already responding is in the hands of the secretariat. I do not know the exact number but I do know that report after report has come to the members of the Continuation Committee. The latest to come to my hands is the carefully studied printed report of the Committee of the Free churches in England, a most interesting and valuable study. A group of theologians of the Episcopal church is at work in the preparation of a similar study.

In addition to official reports there is a constant flow of comment from all over the world. It is quite true that Rome has "shut the door" so far as negotiations are concerned; but the significance of the Conference is easily indicated by the interest which Rome has taken in the matter. There were "observers" from the Roman church at Lausanne although Dr. Barton did not see them. Comments have been frequent in Roman Catholic journals. The German Jesuit, Pribilla, recently published a long and careful study on "The Unity of the Church. Stockholm, Lausanne, Rome," in which the genesis and accomplishments of the two great Conferences named are studied sympathetically and the position of Rome carefully explained. The pope's encyclical of 1928, *Mortalium Animos,* was obviously the official Roman reply to the Conference.

Furthermore, to come back to America, interest has been greatly increased among Christian people in the problem of unity. Many conferences, large and small, have been held as a result of this interest. There must have been many hundreds of addresses made by members of the Conference. I spoke on it over forty times during the year following, chiefly of course to church groups of various names; but also to several secular bodies such as the Pacific Institute of International Relations. I pick up at random a report lying on my desk. After speaking of the unanimity at Lausanne it continues:

> "The impulse of this phenomenal unanimity has set currents flowing throughout Christendom which cannot but make mightily for the healing of the divisions which have marred the beauty and efficiency of the church."

Turning the page I discover that these words are in the report of the Presbyterian church of New Zealand. These things do not lead to negotiations directly, but they do help to create that will to unity without which the divine Spirit cannot achieve. A voluminous literature, the clearer definition of ecclesiastical positions, a widespread and fruitful interest, these can hardly be called negligible results; nor the Conference which stimulated them futile.

Finally, let me touch on the matter of the position of the Episcopal church. Certain untoward happenings have led many American Protestants to feel that that church has throughout the preparation for the Conference been concerned only with a unity which meant absorption of other Christians. Dr. Barton is quite sure that even if that is not the case the Episcopal church is so divided and its Anglo-Catholic minority so determined to have its way that it may as well be left out of account in the unity movement. Now it is quite true that that church is comprehensive to a degree known, I think, in no other Christian communion. It is quite true that there are groups which look toward Rome rather than toward Protestantism, just as there are groups which look the other way. But of one thing we may be sure. The best and wisest leaders of all types are agreed in the desire to maintain this same comprehensive character. They recognize the values of Protestantism as clearly as they do those of Catholicsm, and they are ready to welcome overtures in either direction. The Lausanne Conference is one evidence. It is adopting the methods of second rate politicians to suggest that there was a conscious effort to bring the world to Anglicanism by such a means. The Anglican communion was ready to present its views along with others and to enter into the coöperative task leading to a unity not such as Anglicans but such as God would have.

The concordat with the Congregationalists is another. It did not work out as its proponents hoped, but it indicated the church's desire to find a closer unity with a neighbor. The last General Convention (1928) appointed, with the unanimous approval of bishops and clerical and lay deputies, a commission to confer with the Methodists and Presbyterians on Christian morality in relation to organic unity. A lot of differing views on social and moral questions tend to stand in the way of the movement toward unity. The commission was appointed not to negotiate unity, but to prepare the way for negotiations with those bodies closest to us historically. The invitation has been accepted courteously and I think gladly by both the Northern churches and we hope that the Southern churches will do the same when their representative bodies meet.

But the best evidence of all is the South India project. There the leaders of the Wesleyans, the United church of South India, and the church of England have agreed upon a plan of unity. This plan awaits the approval of the home churches and for the Anglicans of the Lambeth Conference; but one can hardly doubt the result. So far as the Anglicans are concerned it is significant to note that the leaders include vigorous and convinced Anglo-Catholics,—one of them Dr. Barton's friend, Bishop Palmer of Bombay, now retired. In this plan the ministries of all the churches are recognized as of equal standing. Hereafter ordination will be by bishops, but no doctrinal interpretation of such ordination will be required. It is accepted by the non-episcopal churches simply because at the present stage of ecclesiastical development there is no other ordination which will find so widespread recognition. It strikes me that the Anglican communion is not so intransigent after all. Of course, I am prejudiced for although I am not an Anglo-Catholic in the colloquial use of the term, I am, as being a Protestant Episcopalian, a member of the Anglican communion. And yet even in spite of prejudice there seem to be some facts to bear me out.

Indeed, as I read over what I have written about the Conference itself and its results I cannot get away from the feeling that even an unprejudiced observer might think that there is something in what I have with due humility presented. I wonder in fact whether after all the question with which I began may not be to the point. "Which is blind? The alley or — ?"

EDWARD L. PARSONS.

OHIO MOVES TOWARD CHRISTIAN UNITY

BY VINTON E. McVICKER
Publicity Director of the Ohio Council of Churches, Columbus, Ohio

THE state of Ohio during these early months of 1930 is being made "Christian unity conscious"—to coin a phrase in the modern manner—to a degree probably never equaled in any other state.

The movement, sponsored and led by the Ohio Council of Churches, the coöperative agency of seventeen Protestant denominations, began with the great "Centennial Pentecost Celebration" the latter part of January in Columbus. This was a statewide interdenominational gathering, open to any who cared to register, in which "Christian unity" was the theme of a full week's program of addresses and discussions.

Considering the total of nearly 3,600 paid registrations, the impressive array of some 40 religious leaders who came from far and wide to speak and to direct discussions, the frankness with which the members faced the issues involved in the question of Christian unity, the powerful Christian unity pageant especially written and produced for the occasion, the impressive united communion service and many other features, one is justified in expressing the opinion that this "celebration" was the greatest mustering of sentiment on the question of Christian unity that America has ever seen.

The 3,581 registered members were grouped in four different conventions — pastors', laymen's, church women's, and young people's. The clergymen's assembly—the eleventh annual Ohio Pastors' Convention—was the largest, with 1263 registered. There were some joint sessions but for the most part the various groups met separately. A generous share of time on each program was set aside for discussion groups, each assigned to a specific topic and each small enough to afford every member an opportunity to express his views. Findings were drawn up on the basis of agreements reached in these discussion groups.

Organic union of denominations was definitely recognized as a goal in all four sets of findings. At the same time, co-operation among churches and consolidation of churches in local communities were emphasized as immediate aims, pending the achievement of more inclusive plans of union. The question of Christian unity was approached from a "practical" standpoint, with attention centered on the benefits to be gained through unification of Christian forces rather than on differences in creed and polity. Specific union projects now pending with reference to certain denominations received consideration in joint luncheon meetings of ministers of the denominations concerned, with the following groupings: Methodist Episcopal and Presbyterian; United Brethren, Evangelical Synod and Reformed in U. S.; Congregational and Christian; Baptist and Disciple; Brethren and Church of the Brethren (with clergymen of all other denominations together in a sixth group discussing the general question of organic union).

"Our ultimate goal should be organic church union," asserted the preamble to findings formulated in ten sections of the Pastors' Convention. "If this is to be attained, we must become increasingly conscious of the definite gains which it will make possible."

Other significant quotations from the pastors' findings follow:

"The ideal of unity enlists the loyalty of youth. Where local churches have already united it has been possible to appeal to youth in a far more effective and comprehensive fashion than on a denominational basis. . . .

"The present social order will never be Christianized until a united church fearlessly and in a thorough-going way seeks to transform the unchristian attitudes and practices of our time. . . . The weakness of the present peace movement is that in this great moral struggle of our time the church speaks with less authority and commands less respect because of our divisions. A united church will have far greater power in promoting the solution of the problems involved in the relations between capital and labor on the basis of the ethics of Jesus. . .

"Christian unity will produce a deeper piety and more active Christian life in the individual; unify the family group by diminishing diverse church affiliations; satisfy the demand of youth for the same unity in their church life which they already enjoy in the public schools; create a larger interest in the attainment of New Testament ideals; increase the power of the church through a unified voice on moral questions. . . .

"Church union would greatly simplify our administrative machinery, reduce personnel, promote more intensive oversight and curtail expense; would lead to a desirable reduction in the number of religious periodicals. . . . A unified administration would permit the release of the large investments and values of our churches in the center of our cities for the adequate religious occupation of suburban areas. . . .

"Christian unity in the mission fields would strengthen the financial support for missionary work from the contributing churches. . . . The seminaries might well be more largely interdenominational. . . . Union of the denominations would help to meet more adequately the needs of city and rural parishes, helping to eliminate overlapping, waste and neglect. . . . .

"Church union would result in better architecture and would encourage religious education; . . . would make for better preaching, because of freer exchange of pulpits, more positive preaching, freedom to preach essential truths of the gospel, better preparation and a larger sense of responsibility. In their pastoral calling pastors would be united in kingdom-building rather than in competition for church members. Church union would tend toward a multiple ministry with larger staffs composed of specialists in the various elements of the church program. The united church would have a stronger financial appeal. It would eliminate home mission grants on competing fields. Church union would tremendously increase the effectiveness of men's and women's work."

Taking up one practical problem believed to demand a "Christian unity" solution, the pastors went on record in favor of a merger of the Ohio Council of Churches and the Ohio Council of Religious Education, suggesting also the possibility of including the Anti-Saloon League, the Lord's Day Alliance, the Christian Endeavor Union and other agencies in such an arrangement.

The laymen opened their statement of findings with the following sweeping resolution:

"Resolved: That the denominations must be eliminated before the church can claim to be of Christ. We favor immediate action, wherever possible, that may finally result in spiritual and organic union, and that we proceed as rapidly as practicable (*a*) in local communities, (*b*) in missionary efforts and (*c*) by overhead organizations or officers."

Other statements adopted by the Laymen's Convention follow:

"There are too many churches in local fields generally in Ohio, whether large cities or small hamlets are considered, and there are too many denominations represented by their overlapping and inefficient local churches.

"The churches are feeling now more than ever before the serious fact that young people are driven away by divisions, and on the other hand are enthusiastic for united effort and support it. Only a few of the older, more conservative people hold back.

"The success of local church consolidations already proves the desirability of further progress in church union. By consolidation, money is used more efficiently. Better preaching results from consolidation.

"Consolidation is in line with the trend of business. Cooperation, better understanding, consolidation, are in the air and on the air. Christ prayed for it and willed it. The present church situation is unchristian in many instances.

"Little hope is expressed that the older denominationalist lay leaders will bring about union. In youth is our hope.

"Resolved: That it is the conviction of this group that the

Ohio Council of Churches should steadfastly promote a program of Christian unity, and that this program should be supported by an intense campaign of education to bring about the attainment of this goal.

"Resolved: That it is the sense of this group that the adoption of Christian unity would better conserve and greatly enhance the financial and administrative functions of the church, and that the contributions of the church membership would be more economically and effectively used in administrative management, and that the greatest advantage would not only be in the spiritual growth of the present membership, but would include in its outreach the vast body of the unchurched throughout the world.

"Through unity of effort a finer civic consciousness could be built up among young people by unitedly promoting larger interest among them in matters relating to Christian citizenship.

"Christian unity would greatly strengthen the forces in any community interested in adopting and maintaining the work of weekday religious education and in providing adequate curriculum material for the religious training of children.

"There is evidence that the man in the street is more interested in and favorable to Christian unity than the 'dyed-in-the-wool' denominationalist. He is more likely to be drawn into a united church than into any one of the present competing divisions of Protestantism.

"Resolved: That we urge the Ohio Council of Churches to set up in strategic locations in Ohio local conferences and discussion groups of laymen, who will consider this vital problem of Christian unity, looking toward the bringing about of organic union (*a*) of overlapping churches in their communities and (*b*) of the denominations their churches represent."

Among the statements emanating from the discussion groups of the Women's Conference, which touched on "Christian unity," were the following:

"Resolved: That we stress the continued practice of federation and coöperation as steps in our advance toward organic union.

"Changed conditions in rural communities make it increasingly difficult for a number of churches of different denominations to live and function in the same community, and the rapid growth of city suburbs presents the problem of competitive church building and denominational occupation. Therefore the consolidation of churches on the one hand and the organization of some type of community church on the other, are often necessary and desirable."

Youth's eagerness to assume a share of the responsibility in bringing about Christian unity is stressed repeatedly in the findings of the Young People's Convention, excerpts from which follow:

"In both local and interdenominational groups we need first of all to develop the spirit of Christian unity and to consider all these organizations as means to that end. . . .

"Young people should be encouraged to assume the initiative in church unity and in a coöperative and union program. The church young people should unite in an effort to reach all young people in the community. Young people should take the initiative in discovering points in common among the churches and thus find a basis on which different churches may work together. . . .

"A divided church can not hope to produce a united world, for unity must start in your own small circle. . . . A united church can focus more effectively Christian public sentiment in behalf of specific measures to prevent war. . . . A united church will produce peacemakers, for if people are united in spirit they will be peacemakers.

"Spiritual unity among the races will result from the educational program made possible by Christian unity. . . .

"We most certainly are handicapped under our present system of competitive churches and programs in adequately meeting the needs of our communities. Our churches are in need of professionally trained religious educators, now available only to our larger churches.

"While we look eventually to a 'united' church, we feel that the first step must be that of federation while we learn to work together and discover the contribution that each can make to the larger whole. . . .

"Consolidation of churches prevents overlapping work and further Christian fellowship. Christian fellowship is increased because there is no competition between groups. . . . Church members as a whole do not see far enough ahead to realize the benefits of the united church.

"Youth must be patient if they would win friends for church unity. The group feel that modern youth is not interested in denominationalism but rather in winning souls for Christ."

A vivid and powerful pageant, "The Church Triumphant," with 1,000 participants, was presented on four nights, depicting the working of the spirit of unity among groups of Christians from the earliest days of the church down to the present, in a series of dramatic historical episodes. Helen L. Willcox was the author and Ruth Mougey Worrell was producer. The pageant was widely praised for its historical accuracy, its spectacular effects and its dramatic and inspirational value.

The united communion service of the pastors', laymen's and women's convention, in which two thousand participated, was conducted with beauty and solemnity and was regarded as the spiritual peak of the convention. Dr. W. O. Thompson, chairman of the Pastors' Convention, president emeritus of Ohio State University, former moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church (U. S. A.), presided at the service and was assisted by eight other ministers of as many different denominations and by 34 clergymen who acted as deacons in distributing the bread and wine.

Two former moderators of the United church of Canada, Dr. George Campbell Pidgeon and Dr. James Endicott, made a significant contribution by giving in addresses and in conferences a first-hand picture of the growth and results of church union in Canada.

Frederick Norwood of London, England, made a deep impression on all four conventions by his series of addresses. Fred B. Smith, moderator of the National Council of Congregational churches, presented unity as an essential feature of "the church of to-morrow," in the creation of which, he said, laymen must play a leading part. Dr. Frank G. Coffin, Columbus, who shares with Mr. Smith the national leadership of the newly united Christian and Congregational churches, was also an effective speaker.

The Women's Conference was guided through a thorough discussion of more effective coöperation among organized women's groups, both for local purposes and in relation to state and national programs, by Mrs. John Ferguson and Mrs. Josephine M. Stearns, chairman and secretary, respectively, of the National Council of Federated Church Women; Mrs. Jeannette W. Emrich of the Federal Council of Churches staff, and others.

Peter Ainslie sounded a stirring call for the abandonment of attitudes of sectarian superiority. Ralph E. Diffendorfer of the Methodist Episcopal Board of Foreign Missions told of the growth of indigenous unity movements on mission fields. Bishop Francis J. McConnell brought the greetings of the Federal Council of Churches, of which he is president. Bishop William F. McDowell created an appropriate atmosphere for the communion service by his address on "An Interpretation of Pentecost." Throughout the week, William Hiram Foulkes led both pastors and laymen in morning devotional services. Numerous other speakers made effective contributions to the success of the conventions.

H. Augustine Smith of Boston University directed a notable musical and fine arts program which also emphasized the theme of "Christian unity."

Arranged as a great Christian unity "demonstration," the centennial Pentecostal celebration was planned not as an end in itself, but as the starting point of a statewide movement in behalf of Christian unity. This movement is now in progress, marked by energetic educational efforts and by many local gatherings in the interest of fellowship, together with definitely organized local campaigns for closer coöperation in evangelism and other common tasks of the churches.

In recognition of the widespread observance of this year as the 1900th anniversary of the first Christian Pentecost and of the church, Whitsunday or Pentecost, June 8, is the focal point for much of this initial activity. It is expected, however, that the new interest in Christian unity and the new spirit of fellowship kindled by the celebration and by the immediate follow-up program, will continue indefinitely, spreading throughout Ohio and resulting in more and more concrete accomplishments in the unification of Christian forces as it grows. Already regarded as a leader among the states in the practice of interchurch coöperation and in the development of Christian unity sentiment, Ohio is in 1930 moving forward toward new goals of achievement in this significant work.

VINTON E. MCVICKER.

TRANSFORMATION

A humdrum life of gray was flowing
Smoothly on it's course
Some days pale and some days dark
Quiet from it's source.

A shaft of light struck it's way glowing
Straightway to it's heart
The prism broke in a million colors
Pierced by the golden dart.

Each tiny color dainty blowing
In a billion other tints
The quiet life shed it's glorious lights
On other shining glints.

Love was the shaft of light that, growing
Bathed in her radiance bright
The gray little stream, transformed into beauty
—A sunrise from cold morning light.

—*Mildred Holman.*

THE PASTORS' STATE CONVENTION OF THE PENNSYLVANIA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

BY REV. WILLIAM L. MUDGE
Executive Secretary, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

THE Pennsylvania Council of Churches was organized June 6, 1911, in Altoona, Pa. Since this date, it has been holding meetings each year without an exception. The nineteenth annual meeting was in the Zion Lutheran Church, Harrisburg, December 3, 1929. This organization, therefore, reaches back to within a year of the starting of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, which observed its twentieth anniversary, December, 1928.

The actual beginning of the coöperative church movements of Pennsylvania, in this form, was in the Mifflin County Inter-Church Federation, as it was then called, with headquarters at Lewistown. This was the first county federation of churches, and was organized soon after the Federal Council of Churches, and about the same time as the Philadelphia Federation.

It is thus not difficult to understand how Pennsylvania has been in touch with this movement from its inception, and, next to some of the New England states, represents, as far as we know, the oldest and most continuous contribution to the effort, which is being put forth so widely and strongly these days, to hasten the fulfilment of our Lord's prayer, and to conserve and coördinate the denominational values and programs so as to make possible the only practical solution of many of the perplexing and urgent problems of our day.

During this period of almost twenty years, not only have the denominations been choosing official representatives, who have been meeting regularly to consider and further important matters connected with the kingdom, but other significant gatherings have been planned whose influence is being felt in this and other states.

It is quite well known that, during the early history of the federation movement, social service was the rallying point. Denominations were willing to unite in programs covering this sphere, but were rather slow and even unwilling to agree upon methods of evangelism.

Before the world war, this attitude was evident. It is true that gatherings in different parts of the state were held, but no state-wide evangelistic campaigns were possible. Then a considerable change came in Pennsylvania toward united evangelistic movements. For several years, during the world war, and afterwards, the state was divided into three sections, the eastern, with Philadelphia as the center, the central, with Harrisburg or Altoona as the center, and the western, with Pittsburgh as the center. With the help of the commission on evangelism of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ, and under the leadership of Rev. Charles L. Goodell, D.D., its executive secretary, and with the coöperation of denominational secretaries of evangelism, representatives of denominations met at these centers in conferences for the greater part of a day. The interest was often very manifest, and the attendance encouraging. One year the total number present at the three conferences, was 1600 from as many as twenty-four denominations. It was one of the first attempts to organize a state-wide campaign on evangelism, using the county as the unit, and the results were helpful, especially in an accumulative way.

Two years ago last spring, in 1927, a state-wide conference on church unity was held in the Grace Methodist Episcopal church, Harrisburg. The work which had been done in the sectional evangelistic conferences had made this significant gathering possible, together with the approach of the Conference on Faith and Order at Lausanne, Switzerland, the next summer. Those who were present at the sessions will never forget the able papers and addresses, the frank and friendly discussions, and the strong spiritual impressions which were received.

Last spring, in April, 1929, a second conference of the same character took place in Harrisburg, and marked another step forward in the progress toward church unity. The difference between this conference and the other, which preceded it by two years, was apparent, and revealed a closer unity and greater freedom in facing some of the most difficult and delicate questions before the church of Christ. The questions which were presented and then considered without reserve, and in the finest spirit were, "What Degree of Unity of Faith is Necessary in a Re-united Church?" and "What Constitutes a Valid Ministry in a Re-united Church?" No one who attended went away without being convinced that God by his Spirit was accomplishing, what hitherto had been thought impossible, such a real spiritual unity that barriers were being broken down through prayer and effort, and the churches of the state were approaching a new day. The period of intercession at this conference was a great enrichment to all present, and the addresses on "Church Unity, the World's Need," and "Church Unity, God's Will," with those on the intra and inter-denominational movements toward church unity gave added proof that another marked advance had been made.

The last outstanding interdenominational gathering was the Pastors' State Convention which met in the same place, Grace Methodist Episcopal church, Harrisburg, January 27, 28, 1930. It can be clearly seen, through the years, that the Pennsylvania Inter-Church Federation, then the Pennsylvania Federation of Churches, as it was later called, and now the Pennsylvania Council of Churches, working gradually and steadily, yet none the less effectively, was accomplishing its purpose, and one of its great objectives had been reached. The time had fully come to ask the denominations to appoint official delegates to coöperate in promoting a still closer unity by adopting a definite program, which would include evangelism and yet not it alone, but the many side interests of the kingdom.

Accordingly, the state Council of Churches took action unanimously at its annual meeting in the Zion Lutheran church, Harrisburg, December, 1928, and last December, completed the arrangements for a convention when the five-point program of the council would be outlined by the most outstanding speakers who could be secured, giving sufficient time for discussion periods. This program includes comity and missions, religious education, social service, international relations, with evangelism as the prevailing motive, leading this year to the observance of the nineteen hundredth anniversary of Pentecost.

It was decided that, instead of a large gathering which might become unwieldy, the convention should be, above all things, representative, so the denominations were requested to appoint official delegates on the basis of two ministers for every 5,000 communicant members, or major fraction thereof, and to permit others to come who might be interested with the privilege of debate but not of vote.

The result was that those who attended represented seventeen denominations, twenty-nine ecclesiastical bodies and a communicant membership of 1,700,632. As there are approximately 2,000,000 Protestant church members in the state, the delegates were able to speak for a large majority of the churches, and they did so in no uncertain way, for they adopted without hesitation, the five-point program, the delegates of each denomination meeting separately at the luncheon hour and then reporting to the convention.

Among the speakers were the following with their subjects: "Our Need of God," Rev. Floyd W. Tomkins, D.D., rector of Holy Trinity Protestant Episcopal church, Philadelphia, who delivered the opening message; Rev. Hermann N. Morse, D.D., director of the survey of the Home Missions Council, who spoke on "The Pennsylvania State Survey"; Rev. John McDowell, D.D., acting general secretary of the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian church in the U. S. A., "The Church and Social Service"; Rev. Luther A. Weigle, D.D., dean of Yale Divinity School, "The Meaning of Religious Education"; Rev. A. Earl Kernahan, D.D., director of visitation evangelism, "The Dynamic Christ and Visitation Evangelism." These were the speakers for the day sessions.

In addition, Rev. P. W. Snyder, D.D., superintendent of the Presbytery of Pittsburgh of the Presbyterian church took part, presiding as president of the Pennsylvania Council of

Churches; Rev. Dorsey N. Miller, D.D., pastor of the Fifth Street Methodist Episcopal church, Harrisburg, had charge of the service of song, and these chairmen also had prominent places on the program: commission on comity and missions, Rev. James M. Mullan, D.D., superintendent of the department of the east of the Board of Home Missions of the Reformed church in the U. S.; commission on international relations, Rev. Robert Bagnell, D.D., pastor of the Grace Methodist church, Harrisburg; commission on social service, Rev. Leon K. Willman, D.D., pastor of the First Methodist Episcopal church, Wilkes-Barre; commission on religious education, Rev. M. Hadwin Fischer, Ph.D., professor of religious education in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg; commission on evangelism, Rev. Thomas D. Edgar, D.D., pastor of the Second United Presbyterian church, Wilkinsburg.

Bishop M. T. Maze, D.D., Evangelical church, first vice-president of the state Council of Churches, presided Monday evening, and Bishop G. D. Batdorf, D.D., United Brethren church, second vice-president, Tuesday evening. The devotional exercises were in charge of Bishop James H. Darlington, D.D., diocese of Harrisburg of the Protestant Episcopal church; Bishop William L. McDowell, D.D., Methodist Episcopal church; Bishop Robert L. Rudolph, D.D., Reformed Episcopal church, and the period of intercession was led by Rev. S. Winfield Hermann, D.D., pastor of Zion Lutheran church, Harrisburg, and recording secretary of the state Council of Churches.

For the evening addresses, Colonel Raymond Robins, New York city, international leader and lecturer on world peace, spoke on “Implications of the Briand-Kellogg Peace Pact,” and Rev. John Timothy Stone, D.D., president of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Chicago, and ex-moderator of the Presbyterian church in the U. S. A., on “The Nineteen Hundredth Anniversary of Pentecost,” and the convention closed with a brief consecration service conducted by Bishop Batdorf.

The report of the committee on findings was read and adopted without a change or dissenting vote:

“We rejoice that the time has come in Pennsylvania when the representatives of so many denominations can meet together to consider, in so fine a Christian spirit, the coöperative church program of our state.

"We heartily endorse the five-point coöperative church program, as it has been outlined and approved by the Pennsylvania Council of Churches, and pledge ourselves to support it by prayer and personal endeavor.

"We have been deeply impressed with the need of comity work in the counties, so far surveyed by the commission on comity and missions of the Pennsylvania Council of Churches, and we urge our respective ecclesiastical groups to coöperate, in every way possible, in correcting both overchurching and underchurching in our state.

In view of the vital problems confronting the church of Christ to-day in the field of religious education, we join with the commission on religious education of the Pennsylvania Council of Churches, the Pennsylvania State Sabbath-school Association and other agencies, in enlarging the opportunities in this important field by a more faithful and intelligent use of the church school, the daily vacation Bible-school; and in making possible week-day religious instruction at the earliest moment.

"The obligation of the churches to engage in social service must be definitely recognized. Therefore, the encouraging and growing work of the commission on social service of the state Council of Churches is commended — and we shall return to our communities with an earnest purpose to make the church a real spiritual power in serving the needy and unfortunate, and in overcoming the vice and evils which are hindering the progress of the kingdom in our communities.

"Recognizing that the preservation of the Sabbath is fundamental to the existence and advancement of the church of Christ, and essential to the life and usefulness of our nation, we commend the Lord's Day Alliance of Pennsylvania, as a coöperating organization of the Pennsylvania Council of Churches, for its many victories; and we promise to stand with it in its effective battle against all those who would deprive us of the privileges and blessings of the Christian Sabbath.

"We register our hearty approval of the plans and efforts of President Herbert Hoover to secure better observance of law, and our confidence in his wise and fearless leadership. We assure him of our prayers and united support. We rejoice in the growing success of Prohibition, as evidenced by the developments of recent years. The Anti-Saloon League of Pennsylvania is a coöperating organization of the Pennsylvania Council of Churches and represents "The churches organized in opposition to the liquor business." We, therefore, join with the League and all other effective agencies in their crusade to establish Prohibition throughout our land, and in their courageous and aggressive fight against the enemies of the eighteenth amendment.

"These are days which are filled with possibilities for world peace. The London naval conference now in session, the Kellogg-Briand peace pact, the world court, the Pan-American arbitration treaty and other signs and movements of our times, are undeniable proofs of this. We accept the war-peace program of the commission on international relations of the Pennsylvania Council of Churches as a safe and statesmanlike program, and shall urge the ecclesiastical bodies of our respective denominations to adopt it; so that it may become the program of the Protestant churches of Pennsylvania.

"It is generally understood that evangelism is the primary work of the Christian church, and should be its prevailing motive. It is our most earnest conviction that the Spirit of God has prompted the leaders of the church of Christ in our land to set apart the period from Easter, April 20, to the day of Pentecost, June 8, 1930, for the observance of the nineteen hundredth anniversary of Pentecost. And we shall return to our communities with the prayerful determination to conserve and carry forward to the utmost the state-wide evangelistic campaign, as outlined in the suggestions made by the commission on evangelism of the Pennsylvania Council of Churches.

"Above all, we strongly and most prayerfully urge the denominations of our state, through their various ecclesiastical bodies, to approach the anniversary of Pentecost with sincere confession of sin and consecration to soul-winning, that with the fearless preaching of the word of God in union or denominational services during the coming spring, and with importunate prayer, Pentecost may be experienced anew and thousands of such as shall be saved may be added to the church; and the kingdom of God, with all its manifold interests and blessings, may more speedily come.

"The addresses of the many speakers during the convention have been helpful and uplifting, and the devotional periods of confession and intercession impressive and heart-searching. The value and influence of such a gathering cannot be fully estimated. We desire to express our appreciation to all those who have had a part in making the convention program such a spiritual success.

"In view of the blessings received and fine coöperation shown at this convention, we recommend that another be held January 26, 27, 1931, in this city, so that the spirit of unity may be deepened and strengthened, and the coöperative church program of the Pennsylvania Council of Churches may be still better known and followed in our state."

Stanley Billheimer, Chairman, former President of the East Pennsylvania Synod of the United Lutheran church.

J. C. Broomfield, President of the General Conference of the Methodist Protestant church.

William Melville Curry, Moderator of the Presbyterian Synod of Pennsylvania.

J. Rauch Stein, Stated Clerk of the General Synod of the Reformed church in the U. S., and of the Eastern Pennsylvania Synod.

Morris E. Swartz, superintendent of the Sunbury District of the Central Pennsylvania Conference of the Methodist Episcopal church.

Many of the ministers of the state and the prominent Christian leaders have been speaking and writing about the helpful, uplifting and transforming influence of this convention.

Pastors are testifying that they have had new visions and fresh inspiration for their work. Bishops, district superintendents and presiding elders have said that pastors are giving better service in their respective fields, and the effect on the preparations for the observance of the nineteen hundredth anniversary of Pentecost is marked. In practically every city, town, and village of the state, there seems to be a spirit of expectancy, a deeper earnestness in prayer, and a growing consecration in service, embracing the five-point program. Without spiritual power the church labors in vain, but with it, all things can be accomplished.

The story of the past nearly twenty years cannot be read, even hurriedly, without being persuaded of the leading of the Spirit of God, and without confirmation of the truth that the things which are impossible with man are possible to man with God. The age of miracles is not passed. As long as the holy Spirit is permitted to work in and through the church of Christ, there will be miracles and wonders. Before our eyes Protestantism in Pennsylvania, at one time divided, has become united with that spiritual unity, which we trust and pray will make, under the blessing of God, for a greater and richer unity and while God's people meet in Pennsylvania and elsewhere, "in one accord," may there be heard "a sound as of a rushing mighty wind," which shall "fill all the house where they are sitting" and upon them and throughout the United States and the world, shall come such a blessing "that there shall not be room enough to receive it."

"O Lord, revive thy work in the midst of the years, in the midst of the years make known, in wrath remember mercy." May this be our united prayer that, with stronger emphasis on the evangelistic motive and reaching out into the entire program of the Christian church, there may be experienced a true and genuine revival of pure and undefiled religion for the only true observance of the anniversary of Pentecost is an experience of Pentecost.

WILLIAM L. MUDGE.

"ALL GOD'S CHILLUN GOT WINGS"

BY REV. FRED W. HELFER

Minister Eureka Christian Church, Eureka, Illinois

For some time I have been trying to think through my reasons for continuing to preach and support the world enterprise of missions. Just why should we engage ourselves in taking the gospel of Jesus Christ to other nations? Our fathers had a clear cut reason for missions. The heathens, as people other than Christians were termed, were lost without Christ. In order to save their souls from eternal hell, our fathers believed that missionaries should be sent to tell the story of the Cross, so that people might hear and believe and repent and be baptized and be saved. Few there are who hold this theory to-day. With the passing of the idea a new motivation is needed for world-wide missions. I suggest a few thoughts which appeal to me as contributing to belief in missions.

I. I believe that the spirit of missions is born of the Spirit of God. God as we know him in Christ is love, engaged in giving himself to the world. He gives himself in all that we term nature, in those aspects which lift our souls upward; in all the orderliness which we call law; and in all that escapes classification, which we call mystery. He also gives himself through men. He gave himself through Buddha, more fully through Isaiah, and most of all through Jesus. So much do we see him in Jesus that we have come to believe that "God is like Christ." And believing that God is Christ-like, we desire to make it known to the world that the great Spirit of the universe is friendly. In him men may cast away their fear, for "there can no evil befall a good man in life or in death."

II. I believe that the effect of missions upon men will be salutary. The earth is inhabited by many peoples. Living in this one world as we do it is well for us that we come to know one another in our highest moods. It is one thing to go into all the world to exploit humanity. It is another thing to go in the

Spirit of the Master to tell the world of a God of love and of a brotherhood of man. As reports of fine loyalty and sacrifice keep coming back from fields afar, I am led to believe that "all God's chillun got wings." Even from the most unlikely quarters there come human interest stories which make us proud of humanity and remove racial fears from our hearts.

Who can best tell us of these peoples of our globe? Let me hear of them from those who have lived with them, who have attempted to share life with them, who know them best and love them most. The experiences of our missionaries confirm our faith that God everywhere has breathed the breath of life into the souls of men. We need the interpretation of other peoples that our missionaries give us. This world is meant to be a home for man. It can never be that if mistrust and hostility prevail. If our missionaries did not do anything else but hold before us the worth of other races, they would be rendering such valuable service that it would be worth every dollar we spend for missions. We need something to push us out of our provincialism. Perhaps there is no better way than world contacts through men and women who are working for the glory of God and good-will among men.

III. I believe that all the peoples of the world have a contribution to make to the cause of Christ. We shall not fully appreciate Christ anywhere until he is known and loved everywhere. The different peoples are to "bring each its peculiar gift" to the city of God. Now and then I hear disparaging remarks made concerning southern Europeans. I never hear these but that I think of Horace and Virgil, Sananarola, Palestrina, Dante; or Homer, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. These southern Mediterranean lands have contributed to our understanding of the gospel. It was among them that our first missions were carried on. There is something attractive about their love for quiet beauty.

The peoples of the Islamic world can bring a deepening insight into our conception of the majesty of God. They can teach us much concerning what reverence for God and sacred things may mean for life. India with its spirit of quiet brood-ing and meditation may reveal rich veins of character in Jesus which as yet we have not discovered. Into what avenues of spiritual reality they may lead us. India needs Jesus. And we need the interpretation of Jesus which India can give us. Five hundred years before Jesus was born Confucius taught in China. His emphasis upon morality, his respect for age and family have had a beneficial effect upon that far eastern civilization. We shall be able to paint a better portrait of the Galilean when we see him through Chinese eyes as well as our own. The negro race with its forbearance, forgiveness, and its spirituals will enrich our culture.

The peoples of the world need Jesus and will never know him until we take him to them. However, we, too, shall never fully know him until we are willing to receive him back from the peoples of the world.

IV. I believe in missions, for I believe in our missionaries. At the Jerusalem conference they wrote for the whole world to read, "Our message is Jesus Christ." He is the revelation of what God is and what man may become. They recorded their impelling motive, "The gospel is the answer to the world's need."

They stated clearly what was not their motive. They repudiated any attempt on the part of trade or government to use the missionary cause for ulterior motives. Expressing their belief in the sacredness of human life they could not be a party to exploitation. They repudiated any symptoms of religious imperialism which seeks to fasten beliefs and practices on others in order to manage their souls supposedly in their own interests. They repudiated any desire to bind upon native peoples those fixed ecclesiastical forms which derive their meanings from the experiences of the western churches. They desired rather that all nationals be given opportunity to work out Christ in their own experiences.

The "true and compelling motive lies in the very nature of God, to whom we have given our hearts. He is love; his very nature is to share." "Christ has become life itself to us. We would share that life." "We believe in Christ-like men. We believe in a Christ-like world. We know nothing better; we can be content with nothing less. We desire a world in which Christ will not be crucified, but where his Spirit shall reign. Our fathers were filled with horror that men should die without Christ. . . . We share that horror; we are also impressed with the horror that men should live without Christ."

Men and women moved by such holy idealism as evidenced at Jerusalem are deserving of our prayers and our gifts.

V. I believe in missions, for therein we are challenged to a higher measure of attainment in the mind and Spirit of Christ. Back from the east has come the call to really Christianize our pagan practices of western civilization. We are reminded that in racial and industrial and international contacts we must manifest more of the Christian virtues. But especially are we reminded of the necessity to heal the hurt caused by the divided church of Christ.

The work on these fields is too great for fifty-seven varieties of religious denominationalisms. It will be hard enough for one great united church. The united church in any foreign field will have all it can do to combat atheism, materialism, superstition. The idea that any Disciple missionary should have to take any native Christian who happens to belong to another denomination and aim to make a Disciple convert out of him before admitting him to full membership is sheer folly. The notion that a native must come to Christ by the way of the Presbyterian, U. S. A., before he can really experience the love of God is egotistical nonsense. There are other things far more important to the Lord than that,—and to men, also.

What a heavy burden we tie on our missionaries. A divided church! The work is too great for that. Wanted,—a united church for Christ and the world! Our missionaries are helping us to learn to live together in a great, inclusive fellowship. Some day there will be such; a CHURCH in which Quaker and Roman Catholic, the immersed and unimmersed, Episcopalian and Congregationalist shall all count themselves brethren together. Not long ago out of the East came a great challenge to the West, "to agree to differ, to resolve to love, to unite to serve."

FRED W. HELFER.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

Anglican Modernists and Reunion

Reunion as a practical church problem is growing in importance. What has recently been accomplished in Scotland, what many hope will be accomplished in South India, has increased the desire for it in England. The conferences of Lambeth, Stockholm, Lausanne, and Jerusalem may have helped to promote reunion elsewhere, but so far as this country is concerned, we have made no advance during the last fifteen years. The reason is clear. We have no practical policy. Those who desire reunion will have to unite in a clear-headed policy. Fervor, aspiration, courage, vigor are not enough. We need to possess a clear-cut policy, and then to secure support for it.

(1) The Modernist desires reunion; he is conscious of the weakness and the scandal caused by "our unhappy divisions," but what kind of reunion does he want? Plainly he wants a form of reunion which will promote and not check the spirit of truth, freedom, and love in the church. Any form of reunion which denies or restricts the spirit of truth, freedom, and love the Modernist cannot support, but is bound to oppose with all his power. The Modernist desires not a black but a white international. A reunion of Christendom which would check the development of the Christian religion and so reduce its power of expansion would prove a curse and not a blessing to mankind.

There are many who are working for reunion, but it is reunion with an imperialist annd unreformed Romanism. The Modernist must obviously oppose such efforts. Reunion with Rome, as Rome is at present, would mean surrender to tyranny and superstition. Such reunion, if accomplished, would be a calamity of the first magnitude. The Modernist does not feel convinced that the church of Rome will never exchange the spirit of Caesarism for the spirit of Christ — all things are possible. Nevertheless, it was the spirit of Caesarism which was mainly, if not entirely, responsible for the shattering of Christian unity, and until that spirit is exorcised negotiations for reunion with Rome are not only fatuous, but are even disloyal to the spirit of Christian truth and freedom, and also, as reflection will show, to the spirit of Christian love. This being so the Modernist can, at the present time, only support the policy of reunion with non-Roman Christendom. And in the non-Roman sphere his chief effort will be to secure reunion with the Reformed churches, and especially with those existing within the British empire. We do not value lightly the privileges of Christian fellowship with the continental reformed churches and with the much-enduring Orthodox churches of the East, but we are rightly told that "charity begins at home." To love our ecclesiastical neighbors, to reunite with those who have been separated from us during the last three hundred and fifty years and for whose separation we are in some measure to blame, that is our first duty. Home reunion would enable us to solve very quickly and comparatively easily the reunion problems in the foreign mission field.

(2) How is the Modernist going to proceed in the field of home-reunion? This is a very important question. Dr. Sanday said on one occasion:

"I do not say that he took hold of the wrong end of the stick: I think he took hold of the right end of the stick, but what I am sure of is that he took hold of the right end in the wrong way."

There has been a good deal of that in our efforts to secure reunion at home.

We hold that the first thing the Modernist must work for in the church of England is *open communion.* By first we mean first in importance and first in time. He must strive to secure the declaration by our church authorities that all communicants of other Christian bodies are free and welcome, should they desire it, to receive holy communion in the English church. Such a declaration would provide the sincerest testimony to the *validity* of the sacraments as ministered in the Free churches and to our acknowledgment of the grace of the holy Spirit operative in their ministers and their ministerial acts. If we admit their communicants to our feast of Christian fellowship, then we acknowledge thereby in the most practical way that those who have been admitted to communion in the Free churches are real communicants and that those who made them communicants are true ministers of Jesus Christ. If we do not do this, all our affirmations about the grace of God and the power of the holy Spirit manifest in their ministries are of very little worth. Interchange of pulpits, fraternal gatherings of ministers, united services on great public occasions, coöperation in philanthropic activities and in moral crusades, although not without their value, have failed to reunite the separatist bodies. The policy of *open communion in the English church for communicants of all other Christian bodies* would do more than any of these other efforts to eliminate schism.

(3) In conjunction with, but in subordination to this policy, *interdenominationalism* should be encouraged. Our English sovereign is a member of two churches. There are many of his subjects who would gladly be the same. There are not a few who do not wish to renounce the church of their youth, their parents, their friends, their native place, who yet desire to share in the privilege of membership in another church. Such cases are not infrequent. We give an instance of one. The son of a devout Methodist family, after graduating at Cambridge, became a member of the church of England. He was confirmed and finally ordained in it. When he went home to see his people, what was he to do? Should he go with them to holy communion in his old chapel, or break the Christmas harmony by going elsewhere? Being consulted we urged him to go with them. Interdenominationalism of this kind should not only be permitted, but encouraged. At present it is discouraged.

The Modernist must work to secure that the exclusive clause in the present declaration of church membership be deleted. Why should a member of the church of England be required to declare that he is *not* a member of any other denomination? The insertion of this negation into our form of declaration has not been prompted by the Spirit of Christ, but by the spirit of ecclesiastical exclusiveness. Christian love demands its excision.

(4) The third stage in the campaign for reunion will be concerned with *denominational federation.* We assume that this would mean that while each denomination retained its particular doctrine, rites, organizations, endowments, all the denominations would arrange to unite their forces in the various spheres of Christian activity, and to coöperate as allies and not behave as either rivals or competitors. Denominational federation would proceed by stages. It might begin, for instance, with the training of ordinands in common: or with agreement for coöperation in a scheme of national Christian education.

(5) The last stage in reunion is *organic unity.* This would be consummated by all the Christians in England being united

in one body, governed by one system. That seems to us to be a long way off. If organic unity is to be secured, it is plain that it must be of a very flexible kind. There will have to be wide comprehensiveness and large variety in the organic unity. Not institutional fundamentals, but the Spirit of Christ will have to be the uniting bond. It is this loyalty which is the one thing needful if Christians are to become "one flock," and it was that his sheep might become *one flock* that our Lord is said to have prayed in St. John x, 16, not that they might become *one fold* as he is often misinterpreted as saying (see Westcott *ad loc*).

The Modernist policy, then, as it seems to us, should be to proceed to Christian reunion by the stages of (1) *open communion,* (2) *interdenominationalism,* (3) *denominational federation,* (4) *organic unity.* If the first stage be gained, we believe that the others will certainly be achieved in due course. *Mais c'est le premier pas qui coute.*

But it will be asked: Dare we proceed with reunion if it is going to lead to a fresh schism? If we admit Free church communicants to the holy communion, the more extreme Anglo-Catholics will secede. Our answer is clear. By admitting Free church communicants, nothing is done to effect the validity of the holy communion or to reduce its benefits for any faithful Anglo-Catholic communicant. If extreme Anglo-Catholics are resolved to secede for such a cause, then secede they must. It is the old story of the Judaizers being repeated, and we know the line St. Paul would take in such a case.

[From *The Modern Churchman,* Oxford, England.]

A Roman Catholic Newspaper Says the Episcopal Church Is Not Catholic

ACCORDING to Doctor Lynch, in *The Living Church,* Milwaukee, the present official title of the Anglican church in America is a misnomer. He argues that the Episcopal church does not belong to the Protestant group of churches but to the Catholic group ("Roman and Greek").

"Is it not really," asks Doctor Lynch, "a continuation of the ancient Catholic church as it existed in England before Henry VIII: reformed, to be sure, with certain abuses corrected and its allegiance to Rome ended, but maintaining the fundamental and distinguishing marks of the ancient Catholic church? Is it not a lineal descendant, though changed somewhat, from Catholicism rather than a child of the Protestant Reformation? Does it not, by its own refusal to have any dealing with Protestants, deny its own Protestant character?"

It is interesting to note Dr. Lynch's definition of Protestantism. He says: "Protestantism is not non-recognition of Rome, neither does the episcopacy have anything to do with it. The most Protestant church in the world, more Protestant than Lutheranism is today, namely the Methodist, is episcopal, as are certain Protestant communions on the continent. It is not the rejection of ritualism — the most ritualistic service I have seen was in a Congregational church in London. No, Protestantism is not any of these things. Protestantism is the acceptance of the doctrine of "justification by faith alone" rather than by achievement or works, which justification is a matter between the individual and Christ without the mediation of either priest or sacraments. It is the rejection of a priesthood of any sort except the priesthood of all believers."

Too Narrow

Dr. Lynch's definition of Protestantism as given above is quite too narrow to embrace the immense variety of Protestant sects and denominations as they exist to-day. It would be impossible to line up all the Protestant churches of this day and generation under Luther's original doctrine of justification by faith only. The "Catholic Apostolic church," for example, founded by Rev. Edward Irving, an ex-Presbyterian minister, is it to be classified as belonging to the Catholic group, just because the Irvingites have chosen to call themselves thus? We should rather say that they were an extreme product of Protestant interpretation of the sacred Scriptures. Suppose the church of Sweden should develop a high church party similar to the Anglo-Catholics, repudiating utterly all Lutheran doctrines and claiming that their bishops are just as much successors of the apostles as the Anglo-Catholics claim the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal church to be. Would this change of front on the part of the Swedish Lutherans, who have retained an episcopal form of government, translate them from the Protestant to the "Catholic group?"

John Alexander Dowie, the faith healer of Chicago, called the sect he founded and which survives him at Zion City, Catholic Apostolic. Was he less or more Protestant than Edward Irving?

Going back to the origin of the term Protestant, the Diet

How the Title Originated

of the Holy Roman Empire, assembled at Spyer in April, 1529, resolved that according to the decree promulgated at the Diet of Worms (1524), communities in which the new religion was so far established that it could not without great trouble be altered, should be free to maintain it, but until the meeting of the council they should introduce no further innovations in religion and should not forbid the mass or hinder Catholics from assisting thereat. Against this decree, and especially against the last article the adherents of the new evangel, namely, the Elector Frederick of Saxony, the Landgrave of Hesse, the Margrave Albert of Brandenburg, the dukes of Luneburg, the princes of Anhalt, together with the deputies of 14 of the free and imperial cities entered a solemn protest as unjust and impious. It was this protest which originated the term Protestant. The meaning of the protest was that the dissentients did not propose to tolerate Catholicism within their borders. On that account they were called Protestants. In its origin, therefore, the name signified no toleration for Catholics and by Catholics were meant members of the Catholic church in communion with the apostolic see of Rome and presided over by the successor of Saint Peter.

Protestantism to this very day in all its ramifications has but one common denominator or characteristic; a Protestant is one who dissents from the jurisdiction of the apostolic see. But some one will ask: What about the Orthodox East? To this we reply: The Orthodox East represents a dissent and separation from communion with the apostolic see five hundred years previous to the Western rebellion against the successor of Saint Peter and therefore stands as a class by itself.

Both history and general opinion will support us when we say that all those churches of the West which separated themselves or were cut off from communion with the apostolic see, whether the church of England or the church of Norway and Sweden, or the new churches that came into existence at the time of the reformation or since, all belong to the Protestant group. They may differ one from another but they all have one single characteristic common to all; they are unanimous in rejecting the rule of that supreme shepherd Christ constituted over his church when he said to St. Peter after his resurrection, "Feed my sheep, rule my sheep, feed my lambs," — of course they deny that the pope's jurisdiction is by divine authority, otherwise they would convict themselves before God and man of rebellion and no sincere Christian in good conscience would write himself down deliberately as a rebel against the vicar of Christ. That would be intolerable.

Dislike of the Name a Recent Development

As far as the Protestant Episcopal church in the United States, or the church of England, is concerned, it is only since the Oxford Movement and the coming into being of the so-called Anglo-Catholic party, that this section of Christianity has begun to be ashamed of the word Protestant. The Anglicans of a hundred years ago had no idea that they were not Protestants. Even Dr. Manning, bishop of New York at the present time, glories in his church as both Protestant and Catholic, and has said so on several public occasions, if we may rely upon his utterances as reported in the New York daily papers.

According to English law no one can succeed Henry VIIIth and Queen Elizabeth on the English throne and thereby become supreme governor of the church of England, as by law established, unless he or she be a Protestant. Although the declaration of faith to be made at his coronation by the King of England has been modified since the protest of Edward VIIth, the heir to the throne is still required to say, "I declare that I am a faithful Protestant." The King of England may be the highest kind of a high churchman, but he would still be recognized by the law of the land and by the common opinion and judgment of the members of the church of which he is the head, a faithful Protestant as long as he remained in communion with Canterbury, but if the Prince of Wales should become a Catholic, as that word has been understood by Protestants ever since the Reformation, and should submit himself to the jurisdiction of the pope he would be debarred from sitting on the throne of Great Britain.

Dr. Lynch to the contrary notwithstanding, both the law of England and the British public, will continue to regard the church of England as Protestant, and it is also very unlikely that either the American people at large or the clergy and lay members of the Protestant Episcopal church itself will contradict in this regard our English neighbors across the Atlantic.

No Wish to Belittle the Catholic Movement

While thus compelled in truth and candor to differ from Dr. Lynch's definition of what constitutes a Protestant church, we do not wish in doing so to belittle or deny that there is a Catholic movement under way in the Anglican body — a real work of redemption going on in the Episcopal church. Thousands of Anglicans both in England and America do from their heart detest Protestantism and some of them are working like Trojans to purge out the Protestant leaven from the Anglican lump. That, however, is a gigantic task and nothing short of omnipotent power can accomplish it.

Compromise has always been a hall-mark of Anglicanism since the Reformation. Now that the current of a counter-reformation is running so strong in Anglican circles, it is natural that the Catholic party instead of aiming at a complete reconciliation and submission to the vicar of Christ, which alone can make the individual or a congregation of individuals Catholic, they would like very much to be regarded already as a branch of the Catholic church or as Dr. Lynch suggests — to belong to the Catholic "group" of churches. How natural, and at the same time so personally consoling, for the Episcopal bishop of New York with Anglo-Catholics, Modernistic Broads and outright Protestants in his flock, to hit on the delightful discovery and to glory in it, that the Protestant Episcopal church is both Catholic and Protestant. Every real Catholic, however, must repudiate such a compromise. There never has been, there is not now, and there never will be more than one Catholic church and that church Jesus Christ described and defined in that immortal address to Simon, Bar Jona, on the outskirts of Cesarea Philippi: "Thou art Peter and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

[From *The Antidote,* Peekskill, N. Y.]

In the next number of *The Antidote* is the following:

In the church of England and the Protestant Episcopal church in the United States of America there has taken place a gradual but quite extraordinary metamorphosis in the last one hundred years. The ecclesiastical organization has been shedding the outward and visible marks and signs of its inherent Protestantism and substituting therefor the characteristic forms of the Catholic church.

Before the Oxford movement, by way of illustration, an Anglican church differed little in its interior arrangements from a Presbyterian or a Congregational meeting house. "The Lord's table," so-called, stood bare and denuded of any ornaments, neither cross nor candle sticks upon it, while a three decker pulpit made the preaching function of the ministry as prominent, if not more so, than that of the nonconformist chapels.

In place of the holy-rood upon the screen there still remained "the lion and the unicorn" symbol of the royal supremacy, set up in the days of Queen Bess.

In those days Episcopalians regarded themselves as Protestants, quite as a matter of course, and would have been astonished to be called anything else.

But in the year 1930 let the passerby enter the doors of the church of St. Mary the Virgin in New York city and he will behold there all the outward and visible signs of a Catholic church. If he should attend the late service in this church on Sunday morning he would not hear the morning prayer droned out by the clergyman and the clerk, as was the custom in the three decker pulpit of one hundred years ago, but he would witness all the ceremonies of the solemn high mass of the Roman Catholic church more elaborately carried out than in St. Patrick's cathedral.

We have known Catholics to go to confession in St. Mary's church on Saturday night and not discover their mistake until upon their surprised ears sounded the words of absolution in English instead of Latin. The adoption of Catholic doctrines and externals of worship is not, however, so pronounced in Episcopal churches, generally, as in the church of St. Mary the Virgin, New York city.

Anglo-Catholics, so-called, still constitute a minority and they differ widely among themselves both as to the degree with which they accept the doctrines of the Catholic church and her ceremonials. The metamorphosis is by no means complete. The Episcopal church has a long road to travel yet before it can become a *real* Catholic church. Even though it were to purge itself of every trace of Protestant heresy and confess the Catholic faith alone and nothing but the Catholic faith, this would not suffice to constitute the Episcopal denomination a Catholic church.

The third plenary council of Baltimore thus defined the church of Christ: "The church is the congregation of all those who profess the faith of Christ, partake of the same sacraments, and are governed by their lawful pastors under one visible head."

Until the Episcopalians have been received into communion with the successor of St. Peter and their ministers consecrated and ordained by true bishops having their commission from the holy see and in all spiritual things submit themselves to the beneficent rule of the great white shepherd to whom our divine Lord committed both the sheep and the lambs of his flock, they will still be something separate and apart from the Catholic church.

It is true that a wonderful transformation has taken place, as we have said, both in the church of England and the Protestant Episcopal church in the United States of America. But as the prodigal son remained a prodigal until he returned to the father's house, so the Episcopalians until they have, individually or collectively, established themselves in the same happy relationship with the father of Christendom as English churchmen enjoyed prior to the violent breach of the 16th century, they will still be Protestant and not Catholic.

As we said in our former editorial, Protestants have an infinite diversity among themselves. There is but one common denominator by which they are all to be recognized. Differ as they may among themselves, by universal consent they deny that the successor of St. Peter in the Roman see is the supreme shepherd to whom Christ gave the commission for all time, even unto the end of the world: "Feed my sheep, feed my lambs, rule my sheep."

How many clergymen of the Episcopal church in days gone by and no doubt at this very time, have asked or are asking the question of the convert minister, who penned the following letter:

"What I should like to know is this: Am I a minister with a Catholic mind in a Protestant church or am I a Catholic priest in a Catholic church?"

John Henry Newman, the first great leader of the Oxford or Catholic restoration movement in the Protestant church of England agonized over that very question, became convinced to his own deep disappointment that he was the former and became not only a Catholic priest, but a Roman cardinal in the only Catholic church that ever was, or ever can be, for Jesus Christ founded not a Roman, a Greek and an Anglican Catholic church, having no communion one with another, and yet, as the Episcopalians say, constituting one Catholic church.

Dr. William McGarvey and his companions at St. Elizabeth's church, Philadelphia, underwent many searchings of heart over the same two fold query and then to their eternal satisfaction solved it in the same way as the author of "Lead, kindly light."

A few years later the Anglican monks of Caldey and the Benedictine nuns of Milford Haven, South Wales, were confronted with the same alternative and they too, enlightened by the holy Spirit, saw the truth of the ancient dictum — *ubi Petrus, ubi ecclesia* — where Peter is there is the church — and they set an example of corporate submission to the chair of Catholic unity — which would to God, the entire Anglican communion in England, the United States and in all the colonies of Great Britain might follow.

[From *The Antidote,* Peekskill, N. Y.]

The South Indian Scheme of Union

The "proposed scheme of union" prepared by representatives of the various churches at work in South India is one that ought to receive the serious and prayerful consideration of all Christian men. Whatever be the final judgment pronounced upon it, the scheme bears fine testimony to the patience and generosity and Christian temper of the men who framed it.

In any and every discussion of this scheme—at any rate among Congregationalists—there are two or three things which can be taken for granted, because we are all fully agreed upon them.

The first is this. We all desire the unity of Christ's church. We long for the day when all who profess and call themselves Christians shall acknowledge one another as brethren, and when there shall be full and glad fellowship amongst them. We deplore, as sincerely as our Anglican friends, our "unhappy divisions." Especially do we feel the reproach of those divisions on the mission field where the rivalries of the different denominations must be bewildering to the peoples they seek to evangelize and must be a sore hindrance to the progress of the kingdom of Christ. If unity is needed anywhere it is needed when the Christian church is face to face—as in India—with a great non-Christian civilization. Instinctively, therefore, we are disposed to view favorably every scheme to make such unity actual.

The second agreed point is this. We freely concede the right of the South India church to decide on its own form of government. We Congregationalists have made the London Missionary Society our agent for the furtherance of Christ's kingdom in non-Christian lands. In the very constitution of the London Missionary Society it is laid down that its missionaries do not go out to establish any special form of church polity but to preach the gospel. We are true to our own tradition and loyal to our own genius when we freely allow the right of the South India church to choose for itself and to go its own way, even though that way, from our point of view, should seem to be a mistaken one.

But that is the first question that suggests itself to anyone who reads the scheme and upon which one would desire much fuller information than we at present possess. Do these proposals emanate from the Indian church or have they been inspired by our European missionaries? Contradictory statements have been made as to the amount of publicity these proposals have received. But it seems almost impossible to escape the conclusion that the great mass of Indian Christians have scarcely become conversant with them. It is significant too that European missionaries—if names are a safe guide—were in a majority on the committee which formulated the scheme. Taking all the circumstances into consideration, it is at any rate open to doubt whether these proposals can be regarded as the proposals of the South India church at all.

But, waiving that point, and regarding, for purposes of discussion, these "proposals" as being the proposals of the South India church, the deeper and more vital question still remains to be answered—Do these "proposals" offer an acceptable basis for union? Are they likely to bring about a genuine unity? The signs are not too favorable. The publication of the "proposals" has revealed great differences of opinion in South India itself. A large number of London Missionary Society missionaries, for example, have expressed their dissatisfaction with the scheme. And similar differences have revealed themselves at home. Certain dignitaries of the Anglican church have welcomed it as a kind of heaven-born scheme; certain Anglo-Catholics, on the other hand, with Bishop Gore amongst them, have bluntly declared that they cannot remain in communion with a church that accepts these terms of union.

Nor are the Anglo-Catholics the only people who find difficulties in the scheme. We have our difficulties, too, and in the interests of honesty and truth it is well they should be plainly stated. Some of these difficulties are *practical.* Take the question of the maintenance of fellowship, for example. All existing ministries are accepted as ministries of the United church. But in course of time the church will become entirely episcopal. Article 6 of the section on the ministry reads thus, "The uniting churches agree that it is their intention and expectation that eventually every minister exercising a permanent ministry in the united church will be an episcopally ordained minister." Yet the hope is expressed that full communion will be maintained not only with the Anglican church, but also with the Methodist and Presbyterian and Congregational churches. But is such a wish likely to be realized? Of course, in thirty years (which is the time allowed for the whole ministry of the United church to become episcopally ordained) things may suffer a sea change in England here. We may be living in another and different ecclesiastical world. But assuming there will be Congregationalists and Congregational churches in thirty years' time, what are going to be their relations to the United church? It is extraordinarily difficult to believe that they will hold their principles so lightly as to be willing to send their young missionaries out to South India to be episcopally ordained. And it is equally difficult to believe that they will take a very keen interest in missions that have become entirely episcopalian.

And what about the relation between missionaries ordained in South India and their brethren at home? When missionaries return on furlough they will be at liberty personally to officiate in Anglican churches, for, having received episcopal ordination, their "orders" will be counted valid. Churches that are barred to their ministerial brethren at home will be open to them. They will be treated as if they belonged to another and superior class than their brethren at home whose churches tax themselves for their support. Such a plan is not likely to promote fellowship. It is much more likely to create friction.

Possibly, however, practical difficulties of this kind may be overcome, but there are difficulties of theory and belief which will still remain, and these are the most serious of all. Congregationalists have no deep-seated objection to episcopacy as a method of government. A modified episcopacy is not inconsistent with our belief in the spiritual competency and sufficiency of the church. Our independency, indeed, may be all the better for some measure of oversight. But what we can never admit is that episcopacy is of the *esse* of the church. In the light of Canon Streeter's latest book, it is foolish to try to maintain that it is the one and only primitive order; in the light of history and Christian experience, it becomes almost a blasphemy to suggest that it is necessary to the spiritual vigor and power either of a ministry or a church.

It is the stress laid upon the "historic episcopate" that constitutes for a Congregationalist the greatest stumbling-block in the way of the acceptance of these "proposals." The very phrase "historic episcopate" has its implications. It is true that the proposals do not insist upon any particular interpretation of the phrase. Nevertheless, the desire to have "continuity with the historic episcopate both initially and thereafter effectively maintained" suggests that back of it lurks the theory of "apostolical succession." And to the Catholic theory of "apostolical succession" we simply cannot subscribe. The theory itself, as Gwatkin says, is "needless and unhistorical." And it flies in the face of the facts of religious experience. It seeks to limit the operation of the Spirit — which like the wind bloweth where it listeth. Unity is a good thing, a desirable thing, but not even for the sake of unity must we be false to what we believe to be truth.

To say that such a criticism as this and the precisely opposite criticism of Bishop Gore "cancel out one another" is the glib and easy comment of the unthinking. The fact that men can interpret these "proposals" so differently shows that there is an ambiguity at the heart of them. Is it likely that a firm union can ever be built on an ambiguity? The foundation-stone must be "well and truly laid" if the building is to be sound and enduring—and the basis of a church union must be laid in perfect candor and truth if the union is to be a union in anything but name.

These "proposals" do not concern South India alone; they concern us at home. They are bound to have reactions on our churches at home. They are therefore to be deeply and prayerfully pondered. But they raise the question whether we are approaching the question of union from the right angle. Is it a question of orders and organization at all? Isn't it a matter of spirit? Is fellowship to be secured by union or is union to be brought about by fellowship? And is there any reason why, as in the primitive church, there should not be the real unity of perfect fellowship, even though there are diversities of ministrations?

[From Dr. J. D. Jones in *The Christian World,* London.]

The United Church of Northern India Is Shy of Episcopacy

At the recent session of the General Assembly of the United church held at Lahore, Dr. E. Stanley Jones remarked that the Methodist Episcopal church was discovering that on the matter of church union in India she was "the hardest nut to crack!" One reason for this, he went on to say, was because from the viewpoint of the recent proposals for an historic episcopate the Methodist bishops were not valid enough for the new South India United church! Whereas for our United church in North India the same bishops were too valid! This vivid way of stating the case leads us to make the obvious remark that "there are bishops and bishops." One must not allow oneself to be tricked into rejecting proposals for union from any source whatever without a fresh analysis of the meaning of words. We should consider ourselves as derelict in performing an important duty if we failed to point out the fact that between the meaning of the term "bishop" as employed in the proposals now before the South India United church and that of the same term when employed by our American Methodist brethren "there is a great gulf fixed." The "bishop" of the historic type is a spiritual autocrat in whose control we beg leave to believe, even though the episcopacy be qualified by the adjective "constitutional," resides eventually the determination of the doctrine and worship of the church: the Methodist "bishop" is an executive officer called irrespectively "bishop" or "general superintendent." The Methodist bishop has no spiritual authority over any other member of the clergy; that is to say, he does not belong to a separate "order" of the clergy distinguished by special spiritual powers and a different "grace" from that enjoyed by the rest of the clergy. Such "superintendents" are already in vogue in many Presbyterian churches throughout the world and the adoption of them by our United church in Northern India would not involve any change in principle in our present doctrine regarding the office of the ministry. So much we desire to say in order that it may be abundantly clear that we should not hesitate on this ground, nor indeed, on any other, from uniting with our Methodist brethren. At the same time, we think it proper at the beginning of the discussion on this subject to point out that to our mind the term "general superintendent" has the advantage of that of "bishop" for the office to which reference has been made, and that for three reasons, at least: (1) The term "bishop" has an unsavory reputation for Free churchmen; it savors of prelacy and popery and from the very start would likely create an atmosphere of dissatisfaction among the members of a church who had not been used to it. No amount of explaining would serve to indicate the proper difference to be observed in such "bishops" and those of the prelatical type. Indeed, this very misunderstanding would, we believe, delay in securing of a decisive vote on the whole subject of union. (2) The weightier argument which we would advance, however, has to do with the bearing of this union upon future unions in India. For we fear that to many in various quarters the adoption of the term "bishop" by a United church in Northern India will be constructed as a stepping stone toward the historic episcopacy. It will open the door for those who will wish to say, "Well, you now have bishops. Come then, with us; accept from us the true episcopacy, for you may as well have the true if you are to have any!" And we fear that too many of our Protestant friends who forget the Reformation will be prone to answer, "Why not?" This type of reasoning, of course, admits of but one final step — Rome! But every one does not see the goal of it until too far enmeshed to extricate oneself. If we mistake not, the type of argument referred to has already been used with reference to Wesleyan "superintendents" in connection with the South India scheme, and if of "superintendents," how much more of "bishops"! (3) Finally, we may as well admit that none of the recent arguments that have been ingeniously advanced whereby it is made to appear that the monarchical episcopate, or any type of episcopate for that matter, is a legitimate outgrowth of the polity of the New Testament has so much as "touched" us. This is because we have a deep-rooted conviction that, though a genuine Christian life can be lived in any atmosphere (that is good Paulinism), yet an harmonious ethos is essential to its being lived at its best (that also is, we think, genuine Pauline teaching). Therefore, we do not believe it to be incidental but rather providential and in accord with the working of the divine will that side by side with the doctrine of "spiritual liberty" the New Testament knows no priesthood other than the "priesthood of all believers" nor any episcopate other than that of the presbyter-bishop, a local person with restricted powers. We do not believe it to be possible on this earth to establish a form of government better adapted to nourish spiritual experience than this simple one which the New Testament provides and we have no hesitancy whatever in commending it as adapted in the highest degree to the building up of character, until men shall become perfect "as your Father in heaven is perfect," which latter is, we take it, the final end and ai mof the Christian religion. Hence, we contend that the further the church departs from this primitive simplicity the more remote is made the consummation of that day when the kingdom of God shall be finally established on this earth. This is our ultimate reason for concern in the matter of church polity, and we can conceive of no advantage to be gained by such use of the term "bishop" as, however innocently it may be intended, at any rate does not conform to the primitive simplicity of the meaning of the term. For these reasons, if in the interest of efficiency it be thought best to create certain executive officers within a United church, we prefer the title "general superintendent" or some other which will create no misunderstandings due to past associations.

[From *The United Church Review,* Ludhiana, Punjab, India.]

A Baptist Newspaper Objects to the Christian Unity Pact

Already more or less historic is the "Christian unity pact," adopted by the Christian Unity League, Nov. 15, 1929. For further study it is here reproduced as follows:

"We, Christians of various churches, believing that only in a coöperative and united Christendom can the world be Christianized, deplore a divided Christendom as being opposed to the Spirit of Christ and the needs of the world. We, therefore, desire to express our sympathetic interest in and prayerful attitude toward all conferences, small and large, that are looking toward reconciliation of the divided church of Christ.

"We acknowledge the equality of all Christians before God and propose to follow this principle as far as possible in all our spiritual fellowships. We will strive to bring the laws and practices of our several communions into conformity with this principle, so that no Christian shall be denied membership in any of our churches, nor the privilege of participation in the observance of the Lord's supper, and that no Christian minister shall be denied freedom to our pulpits by reason of differences in forms of ordination.

"Irrespective of denominational barriers, we pledge to be brethren one to another in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour, whose we are and whom we serve."

With the exception of a single item this whole statement might have been consistently resolved by any representative Baptist assembly, for with that exception it expresses the spirit of the Baptist movement. We believe in a coöperative and united Christendom. We acknowledge the equality of all Christians before God. We hold all Christians to be brethren, "irrespective of denominational barriers."

But to the proposal that no Christian shall be denied membership in any church we can by no means consent. On the contrary, we must insist that any church has the right to decide for itself who may hold membership in it, who shall be permitted to participate with it in the observance of the Lord's supper, and who may exercise the functions of the ministry as its representative. If those who pledge themselve to strive for the pact mean, as the language implies, that they will strive to establish a régime under which such right is to be denied to any church, they are initiating a campaign which will end in futility or a fight.

And it is so needless to precipitate such an issue. If the brethren who sign the pact believe in open membership, unrestricted communion and an irresponsible ministry, they have a right to say so. But in declaring that such a view is to be set forth as the standard by which alone Christian unity can be achieved, they manifest an erroneous conception of the nature of Christian unity and postpone indefinitely the possibility of church union. They launch instead a new sectarianism.

[From *The Baptist,* Chicago.]

The Denominational Disarmament Conference

New York, February 10, 1940.

I was awakened by the voice of the archbishop of Canterbury. My alarm clock had been set for 5:45, eastern standard time, on a Tuesday morning in such a manner as to turn on my radio. But the clock did not wake me; rather it was the strong, well-modulated voice of the archbishop of Canterbury that brought me back to the world of illusion (Eddington), as he began his address which opened the International Disarmament Conference of the Protestant churches being held at the

Lambeth palace in London. "It is with sincere satisfaction," he was saying, speaking in front of his silver and gold radio microphone 3,000 miles away, "that I am present here to welcome the delegates of the principal denominations of the Protestant world assembled with the object of eliminating the evil results of wasteful competition in ecclesiastical armaments."

The archbishop went on to say that all the denominations were proud of their creeds; proud of their achievements and traditions. For this reason the practical application of the principle of the reduction of ecclesiastical armaments has proved a matter of extreme difficulty. Erasmus, Zwingli, Bucer, and Cranmer all failed in their attempts to bring peace. The council of Dort did not accomplish any worthy results toward this end. Nor did the last Lambeth conference. The last attempt at Lausanne was a dismal failure. But to-day the Christian church wants peace and it can only be achieved through sacrifice. The archbishop closed by saying: "I earnestly trust that the results of this conference will lead to immediate alleviation of the heavy burdens of ecclesiastical armaments, now weighing upon the peoples of the world. In this hope I shall follow your deliberations with closest interest and attention."

It was an epoch-making speech in church history. For the first time was an archbishop of Canterbury's voice heard in America. For the first time an international church conference was being broadcast to the millions of Christians in all parts of the world. The archbishop had not made one of the stilted, meaningless speeches that high ecclesiastics so often make. He wore his working clothes and he made a workmanlike address. There was no doubt that he wanted actual reductions. After his speech had been translated he walked out with a slow measured tread and when his golden altar, the only sign of high ecclesiasticism in the convention, had been removed, the various heads of the chief powers made their addresses.

"Dick" Sheppard, speaking for the church of England and appearing somewhat impatient, made a plea for a common sacrifice for the cause of peace. Dr. William E. Barton, head of the American delegation, said in part, "Although we did run into a blind alley at Lausanne it was in fact a first, if stumbling step, toward disarmament. At this conference we determine to make progress. Satan must not be permitted to enjoy this conference. We assure you on our part that we are prepared to remain here as long as may be necessary to achieve our purpose. The people of America demand of us success! therefore we resolve to be successful." Mr. Kagawa, representing the Christian forces of Japan, asked that the spirit of love permeate the conference. Dr. Karl Barth of Germany, who, Count Keyserling has declared, is the one hope of Protestantism, asked that the word of God be taken seriously by the delegates and be used as the pact of peace. Dr. Herman C. E. Liu, president of Shanghai college, expressed the hope that ecclesiastical strife would be outlawed because the special needs of China demand a religion which has the spirit of sacrifice. He pointed out the necessity of courageous action for, he reminded the delegates, "half measures are always failures."

There was no applause either for the archbishop's speech or for the other addresses. It was a gathering where noise of that sort would have been out of place. Even the glitter of ecclesiastical gowns was lacking. All of the delegates wore black morning coats. There were no priestly effects whatsoever. It is reported that the Japanese delegates made the best impression. The only note of aggressive bigotism was represented in a picture of Luther and Zwingli at the Marburg conference, which hung upon the wall of the Lambeth palace. Two Lutherans noticed it and they had their chuckle over history in paint as contrasted with another sort of history in the making.

Two very interesting side features resulted from this first international broadcast of ecclesiastical disarmament. The first happened in the London broadcasting studio. Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick had been asked to give his personal views on the conference directly after the various heads of the delegations had finished their addresses. In order to do this Dr. Fosdick had to miss the thrill of hearing the speeches directly. A few minutes before the archbishop was to speak a member of the staff tripped over and broke a wire leading to the generator. When Dr. Fosdick was told that it would take twenty minutes to repair the damage and realized that millions of Christians would be greatly disappointed if they had to miss the archbishop's speech he grasped the ends of the broken wires, one in either hand, thus restoring the circuit. The shocks of the 250-volt charge of authority coming from the apostolic succession and the leakage of current due to his liberal body of beliefs shook his arms with spasms. But with a spirit of magnanimity he hung on until the new wire was connected. Thus the archbishop's speech reached to the uttermost parts of the earth only by passing through the life blood of Dr. Fosdick. His hands had been slightly burned, yet as he rubbed them together to restore the circulation he remarked that if he had not been accustomed to acting as a circuit between the fundamentalists and the humanists he would not have been able to endure the ordeal.

The other incident occurred at Vatican city, Rome. Dressed in a heavy sweater, old trousers and rubber-soled sneakers, Pope Pius XI sat with a select group of his "medicine ball cardinals" in the Vatican gardens and heard the archbishop's speech by means of a radio placed in the garden for this special purpose. The pope made no comment on the speech, but he did praise the remarkable clarity of the reception. After the archbishop had concluded, the pope and his cardinals resumed the delayed game with extraordinary earnestness.

As all know, this conference is the culmination of the private conversations which took place a few weeks ago between "Dick" Sheppard of London and Bishop Francis J. McConnell, during Dr. Sheppard's recent visit to the United States. The delegates at this conference mean business. Every delegate, save one (not counting Dr. Fosdick) who got lost in the London fog, was present at the opening session. After a reception at the Lambeth palace given by the archbishop himself the delegates got down to serious work. There will be only a very few prepared addresses. The conference is more in the nature of a round table discussion. Every feature of disarmament is carefully considered by experts and then laid openly upon the table for discussion. Because of the delicate nature of the conversations and discussions it is thought wise not to make these somewhat crude attempts at adjustment public. However, daily messages by the delegates are broadcast and the conclusions of the various sessions will be published.

Of course there have been minor difficulties. The press issued an account of a disagreement between Dean Inge and Peter Ainslie, with Bishop Manning acting as mediator; but this report was denied by the parties concerned the next day. Canon Streeter was misquoted in regard to his statements concerning the validity of the apostolic succession. As a result Dr. Barton warned all Christians not to believe everything that the press says, for he pointed out that the reporters are looking for "news," and another "blind alley" conference would be red letter news. He assured the world that ecclesiastical disarmament was really coming, in spite of the doubts of Will Rogers.

Dr. Barton says that the creedal statements of the two hundred or more denominations in the United States can be greatly cut without endangering the religion of their millions of adherents. As far as possible this conference is being kept out of the hands of the admirals of ecclesiasticism and placed under the direction of the open-minded clergy and representative laymen. As a special cable to the New York *Times* says: "Practically all difficulties in the situation seem always to arise from the immediate objections of one group or other of the admirals, who regard the whole problem from an entirely technical point of view." Outside of the admirals and petty officers the delegates feel that they are allies in the great cause of the United States of God. They are determined to be guided by the spirit of Jesus of Nazareth, and to take advantage of modern scientific knowledge. Only in this spirit can the conference hope to reach an agreement on a limitation, reduction or parity of the fighting forces of the various denominations.

As a great Quaker has recently reminded us, we must maintain a sympathetic attitude and have the utmost patience and hope. The success of the conference will depend very largely upon the sincerity and thoroughness of the delegates. There must be the will to disarm. Our prayers, as *The Christian Century* says, should be for the success of this conference, because if it should fail to reduce the creedal armaments of the denominations the twilight of organized Christianity is sure to set in. If creedal armaments are reduced it will mean a saving of an inestimable amount of misunderstanding, ill feeling, superstition, and intellectual dishonesty. The world is crying for religion — a religion which can be workable in a scientific age. The world wants more of truth and less of theology. This conference will succeed only in so far as it reduces the unnecessary and burdensome taxation resulting from the cost of out-of-date creedal battleships. It is also hoped that a reduction in narrow polemic cruisers and sly, underhanded proselyting submarines will be accomplished.

At first we looked forward to the celebration of the Lord's supper with not a little uneasiness. We feared lest some of the delegates should make a fearful blunder. But now we learn that the supper is going to take the form of a banquet with the free churches of England acting as host and Dr. Frederick W. Norwood, of City Temple, serving as toastmaster, where all the Christian delegates will break bread with one another in the spirit of Christ. So our fears are calmed. This supper ought to be a success, for it will be a close replica of the primitive celebration of the eucharist.

We can well be proud of the American delegation and feel that they will do their utmost to bring about results. Such leaders as William E. Barton, Peter Ainslie, Charles Clayton Morrison, S. Parkes Cadman, John Haynes Holmes, Harry Emerson Fosdick, Charles Reynold Brown, Fred B. Smith, Reinhold Niebuhr, William Adams Brown, Daniel A. Poling, Bishop McDowell, Bishop McConnell, Cleland B. McAfee, Milo Hudson Gates, Henry S. Coffin, Charles E. Jefferson, Willard L. Sperry, Shirley Jackson Case, Charles W. Gilkey and Shailer Mathews ought to be able to lead the church into a great intellectual and spiritual reformation. "For I consider what we suffer now not to be compared with the glory that is to burst upon us. For creation is waiting with eager longing for the sons of God to be disclosed."

[From Rev. Stanley I. Stuber in *The Christian Century,* Chicago.]

The Government Calling a Conference for Christian Unity

FROM *The South African Outlook* we learn that at the closing session of the Upper House of the African National Congress, held at Bloemfontein, the delegates devoted their attention to the large and growing number of religious sects in the country, each one zealous to add Africans to its spiritual adherents. After a protracted discussion the view was recorded that the time had come for the establishment of one national church to embrace all the independent organizations. And to that end it was resolved that a conference of all African churches be convened to consider how this could be achieved, and to devise ways and means of establishing a national college for the training of African clergy. This resolution was referred to the executive of the African National Congress, with power to act. *The Outlook* further states that the lust for leadership — to be greatest in the kingdom — has rent the church in South Africa into scores of small denominations. In North America we have not scores but hundreds of small denominations, most of them small in every sense of the term, and we shall watch the South African experiment with interest.

[From *The New Outlook,* Toronto, Canada.]

LETTERS AND COMMENTS

Methodists and Presbyterians Unite

Dear Christian Union Quarterly,

The members of the Methodist and Presbyterian churches of Apple Creek, Ohio, were so intimately connected by ties of marriage, business and association and were so harmonious and successful in other enterprises that they began to ask, Why not combine the forces for Christian purposes? There were 256 names on the Methodist roster and 209 on the Presbyterian. For some time it had strained the energies of both just to keep going. They were second and third in point of numbers in a village of 382 surrounded by good farm lands. No one of three churches was doing much. So one bright Sunday morning in May, 1926, the Methodists didn't open their church. Instead all went to the Presbyterian building, it being the larger of the two. There they reorganized the church-school making one out of two. The young people formed a society, eight men were selected, four from each society to act as a united council and serve the United church in an advisory capacity. There was to be one budget for all current and administrative expenses. Each group was to maintain its separate membership roll and to keep the benevolence moneys separate. The women's missionary societies were to be as they had been, the united circle (aid society) was to be one. Communion was to be administered alternately by the methods of the two churches. The two ministers, an absentee professor serving the Presbyterian, and an absentee student, serving the Methodist, were to continue until September when the Methodist conference was to be asked to assign the first United church minister.

The movement was a success from the first. A wonderful spirit prevailed from the beginning. A group large enough to make an impact was formed. Over night the United church of Apple Creek which was the name adopted became one of the leading churches of the county and one of the best rural churches of the state. They began by giving the pastor $2,200 and parsonage; this was increased $100 on two occasions and is now $2,400, and house, an amount quite sufficient to meet the needs of a minister and to secure leadership for the church.

For three years in succession the young people's society brought home the county trophy offered by the county Christian Endeavor Society. More than 100 young people are active in the life of the church. Community recreation has been sponsored, boy scouts organized and supported, the pastor has worked with the schools and in every fine way the church has become a leader in the life of the community. One hundred and thirty members have been received and a class of forty will be admitted at Easter. The attendance the first year exceeded the combined attendance of both churches the preceding year, by 15%. There has been a gain each year following. A new spirit has come and an air of success and achievement. All are proud to belong to such an organization. Many problems have arisen but none has been too much. On May 4 the church will observe anniversary day which marks the beginning of the fifth year. Bishop Herbert Welsh will be present. There will be morning services, a big dinner, afternoon services, and again at night. On some occassions each year more people attend a single United church service than live in the village.

It would be wonderful just to stop at this point but any reasonable account of the work must record that during this process a small number of Presbyterians with one Methodist family withdrew and are holding separate services. This in no way weakened the work of the United church. If these remarkable results can come where one group sufficiently large to do things is formed in a community where two other groups are functioning, what cannot be achieved in such a community when Christian unity prevails?

Apple Creek United Church,
Apple Creek, Ohio.
J. W. Cleland

Pentecost and Church Unity

Dear Christian Union Quarterly,

The various plans being put forward for the celebration of the nineteen hundredth anniversary of Pentecost this year have the appearance of an attempt at scheduling or staging a performance very much after the manner of revivals. One cannot help asking whether the churches as a whole and the rank and file of the ministry and membership are providing the obvious and real conditions of a spiritual renewal which at least American Christianity so much needs.

If we were vividly and acutely aware of the scandal of religious disunity among us and its impediment to the kingdom of God, we should see how impossible it is to keep Pentecost so long as the present condition continues.

The fact is the west must turn again to the east for mystical insight and spirituality. The orient will yet awaken to the necessity of practicing the ethics of the Christ whom we profess to follow. Said Keshub Chunder Sen, that great prophet of India of the last century, after a visit to England: "I am pained at the vast number of various denominations, professing to be Christians. Methinks I have come to a vast market. Every sect is like a small shop where a peculiar kind of Christianity is offered for sale. As I go from door to door, from shop to shop—each sect steps forward and offers for my acceptance its own interpretations of the Bible, and its own peculiar Christian beliefs. I cannot but feel perplexed and even amused amidst countless and quarrelling sects."

What, indeed, would Keshub Chunder Sen and others with incisive minds from foreign lands say if they visited *America* to-day and viewed its two hundred and seventeen sects? We should not be surprised if Keshub would once more say that "Jesus is again crucified hundreds of times every day in the midst of Christendom. The Christian world has not imbibed Christ's Spirit." We have the sad spectacle of the invisible Christ unable to function through his body, the church, in its present divided condition.

A recent survey in Chicago revealed that the two hundred and fifty Roman Catholic parishes in the city had a constituency of 2,250 persons each. Among the Protestant parishes the average for the Methodists was one hundred and seventy-nine and for the Baptists one hundred and eighty-eight. It is evident that we Protestants dissipate our energy and largely defeat our purpose.

Those who wish to keep Pentecost this year should read again with imaginative insight Acts 2: 5-11., with a map of the ancient world beside them. It was not accidental that the Christian church was born when all those devout souls from "every nation under heaven" were in Jerusalem, which stood midway between Parthia in the east and Rome in the west. Alexander and the Roman Empire had made the world one and in a measure prepared the ground for a rebirth of religion. It was the unity and expectancy of the hour that made Pentecst possible.

Let us not merely talk of reënacting Pentecost; rather let us fulfill the conditions for a greater renewal suitable for our own times! For example, suppose every Christian sect in this country could come together at an American Lausanne for a pooling of their spiritual resources! What power and joy would ensue from such a meeting! Yet we pray for a functioning of the Spirit of Christ in a broken and torn body. God cannot supply the Spirit if we refuse to supply the organism for its expression and activity. The writer will never forget the feeling of spiritual exaltation and glory of the hour when with ten thousand other souls, he partook of the Lord's supper on the morning of the 25th of June, 1925, in the city of Toronto, when the United church of Canada was born. What a fitting celebration of Pentecost it would be, *a Pentecost in itself*, if in America we could see this year the birth of a united church of America!

Does our faith shrink from such a possibility? Has the age passed in the Christian church for attempting the impossible? If so, we are no longer a Pentecostal church. Are we to belive that our Christianity has come to the twilight of its day? Most of us, fortunately, do not accept such a dismal belief, yet our present sectarian divisions give the lie to our teaching about the oneness of God and defeat our work for peace and our missionary efforts.

That we younger and forward-looking men of the ministry, often feel tempted to quit our task when we see the futility of so much we are trying to do is not to be wondered at. Let us see, however, that one of the chief reasons for our continuing in the service of Christ is to help to heal the disunity of the church. Every red wound of his torn body is a tongue which challenges our loyalty to his cause. Let us help in the movement toward unity and vow, this Pentecostal year, that, so far as we are concerned, we shall no longer speak in the polyglot voices of sectarianism but will henceforth speak in the common tongue of love and unity which the world will recognize and understand!

Pacific School of Religion, **Arthur F. Brett**
Berkeley, Calif.

Acceptance of Episcopacy in South India Not Unanimous

Dear Christian Union Quarterly,

From the reports one has read of the 12th General Assembly of South India United church, the impression seems to be current that the assembly was, on the whole, in favor of the scheme of union then presented. As a member of that assembly I wish to deny that emphatically. Not one present held the scheme to be acceptable in the form then presented. One wonders whether friends on all sides have asked themselves the reason for such tremendous opposition. In asking oneself the reason, the discussions of the assembly have come to one's mind. There, everything was pointing toward the assembly throwing out the scheme, when two or three in favor of it, pleaded that to delete the word "historic" before "episcopacy" in paragraph 1, section 3-B, would be a breach of trust to the Anglicans who thought historic episcopacy was a basis of the union discussions, and would bring these proposals for union to an end. Naturally, the assembly wished to do no such things, so it may be said that pleading saved the situation for the present.

But some members wished to know how the word "historic" crept in. And they were given no valid explanation. A letter addressed by the executive committee of the S.I.U.C. from Calicut, Malabar, to the church councils, was said to state explicitly that historic episcopacy had been accepted as a basis of union. I have a copy of that document before me and wish to state that if it represents the acceptance of the historic episcopacy, then the S.I.U.C. has never done so. All that is there *suggested* is that constitutional episcopacy *might* be a basis.

From this it appears that our representatives on the joint committee on union have allowed the Anglicans to go ahead on the assumption that we have accepted historic episcopacy. Whereas I find it asserted again and again by each of the church councils that they do not want episcopacy of any kind. It is only for the sake of union with the Anglicans that they are practically forced to accept any form of it, for they are told very emphatically that union with that section of the church necessarily involves the acceptance of episcopacy. The implication is that the non-episcopal churches are forced to break connection with other non-episcopal churches, in order that the church of England in India retains its connection with the same church in England. Some will assure us that this is not so, but most of us are convinced that no other course is open if episcopacy is accepted.

Some are willing to make this sacrifice of Free church union for the sake of union with the Anglicans. One thinks the present sacrifice for the sake of the former is nothing to be compared with the gains for the future, whereas if union is affected for the sake of a mere demonstration that non-episcopal and episcopal can unite, nothing but regret that such took place may result.

And underneath the discussions and decisions of the church councils and General Assembly, one sees this very fear. It is only for the sake of union with the Anglicans, who demand it, that episcopacy is accepted, and even then great care is taken to modify the power of the bishops until he is virtually meant to be no more in himself than any other minister. I maintain this to be the desire of the S.I.U.C. as expressed by church councils and General Assembly. It cannot be gainsaid; neither will the Anglicans accept it. Let us face it and seek union some other way.

London Mission,
Bellary, S. India. A. A. Taylor.

BOOK REVIEWS

What is Christian Education? By George A. Coe. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; pages 300; price $2.50.

This book deals specifically with Christian education, much of which is becoming anachronistic. Transmissive education is breaking down and there is an alarming defect in the whole system. Dr. Coe makes a brilliant and critical examination into present day conditions, particularly where there is awareness of confusion, difficulty, or defeat. He shows that creative teaching is the necessity of these times. The dogmatic and ecclesiastical must give way to the dynamic. It is one of the most challenging books of the times. He has, as usual, struck the note of the prophet.

There is no ambiguity in his approach. The various communions have their schools. It is the work of these schools that he discusses. He sees that our churches are ailing and that our religious nurture is feeble. Both conditions he affirms are due to our not being Christian enough and he sees the solution in a dynamic Christianity expressed in creative teaching.

There are thirteen chapters. He discusses the plight of the Protestant mission schools in the Orient and the unsatisfactory state of Protestant education in the United States with the possible self-discovery of Christianity through Christian education. The personality—principle becomes the actual fulfillment of the ends of our religion in the teacher-and-learner relationship. Transmissive education gives way to creative teaching and the project idea becomes a practical solution of finding our way out of the entanglement.

He argues that the life of God and the life of man must be brought together in a single thought. God must be found here and the validity of Jesus' attitudes can be realized through the practice of them, or else Jesus will fade into a sentiment and the worship of God will become little more than æsthetic enjoyment. We become individuals by our own acts and our becoming a person is never finished. Personality can grow or its growth can be arrested through play, through the life of appreciation, through friendship, affection, loyalty, difficulty, opposition, defeat, suffering, one's own sinning, and worship. These laws of life are laws for Christian education and they are discussed by Dr. Coe with remarkable clarity.

The scientific method is a necessary expression of personality. He discusses when a man is scientific and the principles of the scientific method and shows that these principles glorify the personal and social. Christianity needs the assimilation of this attitude and method. He contends that the church schools practice the principles of the scientific method more thoroughly than the state, but in this we think he has erred.

He argues, and argues well, that Christian education can be made more creative by facing toward the unfinished task of the kingdom of

God, linking the young with the old and the present with the past. It is this, he argues, which leads to spiritual insight.

He interprets the project-method in terms of interest, activity, and social participation; all on the part of the pupil, with a fourth idea, character, over-arching all three of them like a cloud. "The theory that interest is the main condition of learning has on the whole emptied itself into the theory that activity is the main condition—interested, self-propelling activity. At this point the educative significance of the learner's purpose emerges, his very own present purposes as distinguished from the teacher's aims and from later purposes that it is hoped the learners will acquire. It is the learner's present purposeful activity, the plans that he makes and executes, his own projects—so the theory goes—that most promotes growth."

In his discussion of Christian education of adults, he discusses the passing sermons and says that transmissive preaching is no better able than transmissive teaching in a Sunday-school class to carry through the personality-principle of Christianity, but "there are sermons that quiver with creative energy," "wrestling with the everlasting necessity of recreating ourselves and our religion." While creative Christian education might reduce the membership and wealth of the church it might make the church a fountain of social radicalism, saving it from institutionalism by developing a system of continuous self-criticism, and bring a revival, for which many hearts are longing.

In the midst of a declining faith in God both outside and inside the church, he is certain that the existing Christian education, either Catholic or Protestant, will not arrest this decline and, therefore, the job of the Christian college is to set forth the hypothesis that there is a God, a hypothesis in process of being examined, revised, and tested. It would mark the rebirth of philosophy; the sciences would thrive; and "religion would not be an appendage of academic interests, or even a guest or companion, nor would religious thinking continue to be defensive, for the whole enterprise, suffused with a sense of the worthfulness of the personal, would be inherently and aggressively religious."

ESSENTIALS AND NON-ESSENTIALS OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. By John Mackintosh Shaw, M.A., D.D., Queen's Theological College, Kingston, Canada. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; pages 197.

This book is one of the best presentations of the fundamentals or essentials of the Christian religion in the field of theology from a liberal point of view. It discusses the five points of fundamentalism. (1) The inerrancy of the Scriptures, (2) the virgin birth, (3) the forensic or penal substitutionary view of Jesus' atoning work, (4) his physical resurrection, and (5) his miraculous power and work. Dr. Shaw's answers to each of these points is positive and constructive. He says, "I believe the grand net result of the years of scientific and historical study through which we have been passing has been by removing the things which can be shaken, and ought to be shaken, to make the things which cannot be shaken, the great vital abiding Christian convictions, to stand out in greater relief and prominence." Fundamentalist thinking fares badly at the hands of this clear minded Canadian professor. It will be helpful to read this book twice.

JOHN WESLEY AMONG THE SCIENTISTS. By Frank W. Collier. New York: Abingdon Press: 351 pages; price $2.00.

This book is of interest to protagonists of Christian unity because of its view of the nature of religious knowledge, for the Christian unity movement makes certain assumptions concerning the nature and accessibility of religious knowledge. There seems to be three stages in the production and distribution of spiritual goods. After the insights of the prophets are analyzed and catalogued by the philosophers, they are bottled up and distributed by the priesthood under denominational labels. This book calls for a return from ecclesiasticism to prophecy.

Dr. Collier, professor of philosophy at American University, is one of that brilliant group of students and disciples of Borden Parker Bowne. Bishop F. J. McConnell, Dean A. C. Knudson, Prof. E. S. Brightman, George Albert Coe, William E. Studley, and others have popularized various applications of the philosophy of personalism. Dr. Collier brings this philosophy to the interpretation of one of the greatest figures of religious history.

"Wesley's crowning legacy," he says, "is his spirit of love, which caused him to take a broad, tolerant attitude toward the opinions of others, and which caused him to lay down this principle: 'That orthodoxy or right opinions, is at best but a very slender part of religion, if it can be allowed to be any part at all.'

"Wesley did not allow differences of theological opinion to separate him from his fellowmen. He demanded not that they should agree with him in doctrine, but that they should work together in promoting holiness of life and every good work. He said: 'I desire to have a league offensive and defensive with every soldier of Christ.'"

Dr. Collier exhibits throughout not only erudition and insight but also the rare combination of impartiality and sympathy characteristic of the truly philosophical spirit. He reminds us that controversy profiteth little. "Wesley said, 'I never knew one man (or but one) write controversy with what I thought a right spirit.' Henry Bergson takes a similar view: 'It seems to me that in philosophy the time given up to refutation is generally time lost.' Emerson states, 'Kindness is necessary to perception,' and it is not easy to be kind in controversy."

"It is highly desirable," he concludes, "that Christianity in general and Methodism in particular, be reminded of these first principles."

CLARENCE R. ATHEARN.

CHRISTIAN REUNION IN ECUMENICAL LIGHT. By Francis J. Hall, D.D., Sometime Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the General Theological Seminary, New York, etc. New York: The Macmillan Company; 150 pages; price $1.40.

THE CASE FOR EPISCOPACY. By Kenneth D. Mackenzie, Author of *The Confusion of the Churches*, etc. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; pages 146; price $1.00.

CHURCH UNION IN SOUTH INDIA. The Story of the Negotiations. By E. H. M. Waller, M.A., Bishop of Madras. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; pages 96.

It would be profitable to read these three books together. They are able presentations of episcopacy. Dr. Hall is one of the dearest spirits in the whole church and is always lucid in his statements. An article by him in this number of *The Christian Union Quarterly* is confirmation of that fact. Dr. Mackenzie has written a valuable book on Christian unity and this may be regarded as a follow-up volume. His opening chapter gives an illustration which is a fair interpretation of the book. He says, "There is a story of a rather dour Evangelical who conscientiously declined to rise from his seat when the clergyman came in to conduct a service. 'I do not stand up when my servants come into the room,' he said. If we will compare that with a picture of an enthusiastic Catholic kneeling at the bishop's feet and kissing his ring, we shall have an illustration, clear enough, though no doubt somewhat exaggerated, of two contrasted attitudes to the Christian ministry." In Bishop Waller's book is a painstaking recital of the story of the negotiations for church union in South India in which episcopacy is involved. Some of the Angelican bishops favor the union and others dissent from it. It will be one of the questions on the agenda of the Lambeth conference this summer. Dr. Hall in his book takes issue with Canon Streeter, who affirms that one order in the primitive church is an illusion, there being at the end of the first century different systems of church government in different provinces of the Roman empire—Episcopalian, Presbyterian and Independency. Dr. Hall maintains that "no real evidence has been obtained that non-episcopal ordinations, in the later use of terms, were performed, or if performed were accepted as valid, in the primitive church." And he further says that episcopal ordination "is an unescapable condition of full Christian reunion." He affirms that if the South India proposal is adopted it will imperil the Catholic status of the Anglican communion at large. All three books are interesting. Episcopacy has

the same charm about it that the divine right of kings had in the political governments of the world. The question confronting us is: Are we still thinking in these terms?

CHINA CHRISTIAN YEAR BOOK, 1929. Edited by Rev. Frank Rawlinson, D. D., Editor *Chinese Recorder.* Shanghai: Christian Literature Society; 563 pages.

This is the sixteenth issue of the *China Christian Year Book.* Nearly half of the contributed articles are by Chinese. It discusses the political progress of China, its financial and economic reconstruction, its social and moral problems, development of religious thought, education and religion and such like questions. It is remarkably comprehensive and informing. It affirms that change is the keynote of the present situation both of Christianity in China and the Chinese nation, there being a new motive, a new purpose, and a new spirit abroad. It affirms that in spite of the whirlpool of events and chaotic conditions Christianity has moved forward in 1929 and there is a widespread knowledge of Christ beyond membership in the various communions. Seventy-two percent of the Protestants in China are identified with the National Christian Council of China. The fact that twenty-eight percent of Protestants are outside of the National Council indicates the influence of American and European denominationalism, working diligently to keep Christians apart. Many of our missionary boards are as deeply interested in keeping their converts apart as making converts. But the year book is one of the most valuable volumes that can be gotten on China from a Christian point of view. It puts in one's possession the very best interpretation of that great rising republic across the Pacific.

SCIENCE AND THE UNSEEN WORLD. By Arthur Stanley Eddington, F.R.S., Author of *The Nature of the Physical World*, etc. New York: The Macmillan Company; pages 91; price $1.25.

This is one of the Swarthmore lectures, being delivered last year at the Friends' House, London. It makes a brief survey of the evolutionary processes leading to the advent of man in the physical world and his relation to the unseen world. Both a scientific and mystical outlook are involved in the problem of experience. "Ought" has a powerful urge in life and man is at his best when he is a seeker. It is not of so much concern as to the existence of God, but rather the revelation of God, who is personal, not in the sense of the medieval painters, but in the conception of the personality that dominates the unseen world. Each generation must seek to go beyond the formation out of which it came. There is a sureness in this method, which is very different from cocksureness. It is a well thought through lecture.

Religion, Whence and Whither. By Rev. Clifton Macon, D.D. New York: Association Press; 96 pages.

There are five chapters in this book: The Bible—what it is; the Bible—how to read it; the church—how it came to be; the creeds—how they developed; and the next reformation. Its introduction is written by Dr. Robert Norwood, rector of St. Bartholomew's church, New York. There is a facinating vigor in this book that increases its value beyond the able treatment of the subjects. It points the way out of our entanglements by the method of constant growth, growing away from the yokes of doctrinal formulæ and outward liturgies and growing into the simplification of Christianity under the leadership of the Spirit of Christ. The new reformation "will come from an earnest desire on the part of all Christians to disencumber religion from impending accretions and to make it more easily understood and generally acceptable." It is a clear and courageous message.

The Book of Common Prayer. Milwaukee. Morehouse Publishing Co.; pages 598; price in cloth 25 cents and, depending on quality of binding, up to $5.00.

This is a beautiful piece of work. It is well called the "cleartype edition." Every page invites one's admiration. It is full of valuable information not only for the Protestant Episcopalians but for all Christians. Its prayers are among the most beautiful to be found anywhere, its order of service is worshipful and, from the beginning to the end, it will be found a valuable book in devotional study for any Christian who is seeking for his growth in spiritual life. It has always been a book of merit. In its revised form it has still greater merit. By far the most beautiful liturgies are those of the Episcopal church. We wish however, that all these denominational books of worship would sweep the whole field, dropping their denominational peculiarities and making their approach to God inclusive of the whole family of God. This will come later.

Leaves from the Notebook of a Tamed Cynic. By Reinhold Niebuhr, Professor of Religion and Christian Ethics in Union Theological Seminary, New York. Chicago: Willett, Clark & Colby; pages 198; price $2.00.

One of the most brilliant and fascinating minds in America is the author of this book. These notes illustrate the typical problems of the modern minister. They are charmingly human and simple. It is a record of daily experiences in the life of a minister in a large city and no one could tell these experiences better than Dr. Niebuhr, who expresses "an uneasy conscience" in giving these notes to the public. But the book makes good reading and the minister who reads these pages will frequently feel the comradship of the author.

The Christian Union Quarterly

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND
INTERNATIONAL

Contents of
Volume XIX

JULY, 1929 TO APRIL, 1930

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Ainslie, D.D., Rev. Peter

PAGE

- At the Editor's Desk 99, 291
- Backward Actions 7
- Business and Church Standards Contrasted 204
- Christian Unity to the Front 5
- Congregational and Christian Merger 205
- Is Christian Reconciliation Possible in This Generation? 103
- New York Conference, The 3, 195
- Protestant End of the Episcopal Bridge Dangles, The 201

- Ainslie's, Dr. Defense of the League—The New York Times 238
- Acceptance of Episcopacy in South India Not Unanimous—Rev. A. A. Taylor 371
- "All God's Chillun Got Wings"—Rev. Fred W. Helfer 341
- American Church Monthly, The A Courageous Bishop 257
- Anglican Modernists and Reunion—The Modern Churchman 345
- Another View of the South India Union—Rev. Arthur A. Taylor 187
- Atkinson, D.D., Rev. Henry A. The Religions of India 37
- Antidote, The. A Roman Catholic Newspaper Says the Episcopal Church is not Catholic 348
- Athearn, Clarence R. John Wesley Among the Scientists 375

- Banninga, D.D., Rev. John J. Further Progress in Church Union in South India 128
- Baptist Newspaper Objects to the Christian Unity Pact, A—The Baptist 361
- Baptist, The. A Baptist Newspaper Objects to the Christian Unity Pact 361
- Book Reviews 92, 191, 282, 373
- Bowie, D.D., Rev. W. Russell. The Equality of Christians 212
- Brent, Charles Henry: An Appreciation—Rt. Rev. Edward L. Parsons 9
- Brett Rev. Arthur F. Pentecost and Church Unity 369
- Buckley, Sara Virginia. A Prayer for Tolerance 233
- Bulletin of the Federal Council of Churches—A Prayer for the Spiritual Union of Mankind 58

- Canadian Journal of Religious Thought, The. The Reunion of the Scottish Church 275
- Can they Get Together in the Philippines?—Rev. E. K. Higdon 190
- Catholicity of Congregationalism, The — Rev. Edward Tallmadge Root, D.D 68
- Catholic Gazette, The. The Hope of This Generation is the Reunion of Non-Episcopalians 168
- Cheney, Mrs. E. D. The Larger Prayer 64
- Christian Century, The—Christian Unity in the Philippines 87
- Christian Century, The—Christian Unity Idealism Now on Bedrock 257
- Christian Herald Institute—Merger of Young People's Societies 86
- Christian Unity in the Philippines—The Christian Century 87
- Christian Unity Idealism Now on Bedrock—The Christian Century 257
- Churchman, The. Freedom Under Law 252
- Church Federations—Rev. Ross W. Sanderson, D.D 59
- Church Unity—The World's Need—Frank A Horne 158
- Churchman, The. Bishop Manning Usurped Authority in the Opinion of Dr. Grammer 242

PAGE
Church of Christ in China, The—The New Outlook ... 87
Clark, Thomas Curtis. The New Eden ... 36
Clark, Thomas Curtis. Who Will Build the World Anew? ... 25
Clearing up Misunderstandings—Rev. George Zurcher ... 88
Cleland, Rev. J. W. Methodists and Presbyterians Unite ... 368
Coffin, Dr. Offers Own Church—The New York Times ... 237
Community Church, The—Rev. Cliff Titus ... 65
Congregationalist, The. A Graceless Bishop ... 255
Consecration—Dwight E. Marvin ... 18
Constitution and By-Laws—Rev. Ruter W. Springer ... 185
Courageous Bishop, A—The American Church Monthly ... 257
Creeds and Deeds—Edgar Cooper Mason ... 211

Denominations and Unity—Rev. Richard K. Morton ... 225
Denominational Disarmament Conference, The—Rev. Stanley I. Stuber 362
Diocesan Council of Virginia Favor the Reconciliation Pact, The—The Richmond News Leader ... 86

Essentials of the Reformed Faith and System to be Conserved in Proposed Church Unions—President George W. Richards ... 135
Equality of Christians, The—Rev. W. Russell Bowie, D.D. ... 212
Evans, D.D., Rev. D. J. The Next Step Toward Christian Unity ... 26
Evasions and Inhibitions, Our—Rev. Karl Reiland ... 180

Freedom Under Law—The Churchman ... 252
Friendship—Elinor Lennen ... 222
Further Progress in Church Union in South India—Rev. John J. Banninga, D.D. ... 128

Garrett, Ph.D., Alfred C. What is a Valid Ministry for a United Church ... 149
Goddard, Dr. O. E. on Christian Unity at the Vanderbilt Rural Church School ... 89
Government Calling a Conference for Christian Unity, The. The New Outlook ... 367
Graceless Bishop, A—The Congregationalist ... 255
Grammer, S.T.D., Rev. Carl Eckhardt. Why I Consider the Protestant Episcopal Church One of the Protestant Group ... 310

Haley, Molly Anderson. Intolerance ... 49
Hall, D.D., Rev. Francis J. How Far the Protestant Episcopal Church Can Go With Protestants ... 31
Helfer, Rev. Fred W. "All God's Chillun Got Wings" ... 341
Herald of Gospel Liberty, The. Plan of Union of the Congregational and Christian Churches ... 268
Higdon, Rev. E. K. Can They Get Together in the Philippines? ... 190
Holman, Mildred. Transformation ... 331
Hope of This Generation is the Reunion of Non-Episcopalians, The—The Catholic Gazette ... 168
Horne, Frank A. Church Unity—The World's Need ... 159
How Love Rules and Reigns—R. C. French ... 76
How Far the Protestant Episcopal Church Can Go With Protestants—Rev. Francis J. Hall, D.D. ... 301
Hoye, Rev. J. Mitchell. Dr. O. E. Goddard on Christian Unity at the Vanderbilt Rural Church School ... 89

PAGE

Intolerance—Molly Anderson Haley 49
Is the Protestant Episcopal Church a Protestant Church?—Dr. Frederick Lynch 265
Israel, Rabbi Edward L. "The Scandal of Christianity" 116

Jefferson, Dr. Charles E. Recent Explosion Was a Good Thing 263
Jones, Dr. J. D. The South Indian Scheme of Union 355

Larger Prayer, The. Mrs. E. D. Cheney 64
Lennen, Elinor. Friendship 222
Letters and Comments 88, 185, 368
Liberty and Corporate Fellowship: The Keynote of the United Church—Principal W. Robinson 77
Living Blend, The. Robert Whitaker 314
Living Church, The. One More Handicap to Church Unity 249
Lloyd, D.D., Most Rev. Frederic E. J. The Order of Antioch 83
Long, Kathleen N. A Prayer 309
Lunn's, Sir Henry. Letter to the New York Times and Dr. Ainslie's Reply 246
Lynch, D.D., Rev. Frederick. The Reaction to the Christian Unity Pact 19
Lynch, D. D., Rev. Frederick. Is the Protestant Episcopal Church a Protestant Church? 265

Manning, Bishop, Forbids Dr. Coffin, a Presbyterian, to Celebrate the Lord's Supper in St. George's Church 234
Manning, Bishop, Usurped Authority in Opinion of Dr. Grammer 242
Marvin, Dwight E. Consecration 18
Mason, Edgar Cooper. Creeds and Deeds 211
McCasland, Ph.D., Selby Vernon. Um Kirchliche Einheit 282
McVickers, Vinton E. Ohio Move Toward Christian Unity 323
Mencken, H. L. "The Scandal of Christianity" 125
Merger of Young People's Societies—Christian Herald Institute 86
Message to Christians in All the Churches from the Christian Unity League 207
Methodists and Presbyterians Unite—Rev. J. W. Cleland 368
Modern Churchman, The. Anglican Modernists and Reunion 345
Morton, Rev. Richard K. Denominations and Unity 225
Move for Union in Northern India, A—The New Outlook 176
Mudge, Rev. William L. The Pastors' State Convention of the Pennsplvania Council of Churches 332

New Eden, The. Thomas Curtis Clark 36
New Outlook, The. The Church of Christ in China 87
New Outlook, The. A Move for Union in Northern India 176
New Outlook, The. The Government Calling a Conference for Christian Unity 367
New York City Journal, The. The World Laughs Out Ioud 267
New York Times, The. Sir Henry Lunn's Letter to the New York Times and Dr. Ainslie's Reply 246
New York Times, The. Dr. Ainslie's Defense of the League 238
Next Step Toward Christian Unity, The—Rev. D. J. Evans 26

Ohio Moves Toward Christian Unity—Vinton E. McVickers 323
One More Handicap to Church Unity—The Living Church 249
Order of Antioch, The—Most Rev. Frederic S. J. Lloyd 83

PAGE

Parsons, D.D., Rt. Rev. Edward L. Charles Henry Brent: An Appreciation 9
Parsons, D.D., Rt. Rev. Edward L. Which is Blind? The Alley or —? 315
Pastors' State Convention of the Pennsylvania Council of Churches—Rev. William L. Mudge 332
Pentecost and Church Unity—Rev. Arthur F. Brett 369
Piety, Chauncey R. The Way 67
Plan of Union of the Congregational and Christian Churches, The—The Herald of Gospel Liberty 268
Prayer for the Spiritual Union of Mankind—Bulletin of the Federal Council of Churches 58
Prayer for Tolerance, A.—Sara Virginia Buckley 233
Prayer, A—Kathleen N. Long 309

Quarterly Register, The. Union of Scotch Presbyterians 170

Reaction to the Christian Unity Pact, The—Rev. Frederick Lynch, D.D. 19
Recent Explosion Was a Good Thing—Dr. Charles E. Jefferson 263
Reiland, D.D., Rev. Karl. Our Evasions and Inhibitions 180
Reiland, Dr.'s Letter—The New York Times 237
Reunion of the Scottish Church, The—The Canadian Journal of Religious Thought 275
Richards, D.D., President George W. Essentials of the Reformed Faith and System to be Conserved in Proposed Church Unions 135
Review of the Churches, The. The South Indian Reunion Scheme 171
Religions of India, The—Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, D.D 37
Richmond News-Leader, The. The Diocesan Council of Virginia Favor the Reconciliation Pact 86
Robinson, M.A., Principal W. Liberty and Corporate Fellowship: The Keynote of the United Church 77
Roman Catholic Newspaper Says the Episcopal Church is Not Catholic, A—The Antidote 348
Root, D.D., Rev. Edward Tallmadge. Catholicity of Congregationalism 68

Sanderson, Rev. Ross W. Church Federations 59
Sayres, Rev. Alfred Nevin. "The Scandal of Christianity" 113
"Scandal of Christianity," The—Michael Williams, Rev. C. B. Wilmer, D.D., Rev. Alfred Nevin Sayres, Rabbi Edward L. Israel, and H. L. Mencken 106
Significance of Infancy, The—Edwin D. Starbuck, Ph.D 29
South Indian Scheme of Union—Dr. J. D. Jones 355
South Indian Reunion Scheme, The—The Review of the Churches 171
Springer, Rev. Ruter W. Constitution and By-Laws 185
Statement of Dissent from Thirteen Episcopal Rectors 240
Stuber, Rev. Stanley I. The Denominational Disarmament Conference 362

Taylor, Rev. Arthur A. Another View of the South India Union 187
Taylor, Rev. A. A. Acceptance of Episcopacy in South India Not Unanimous 371
Titus, Rev. Cliff. The Community Church 65
Transformation—Mildred Holman 331
Trench, R. C. How Love Rules and Reigns 76

Um Kirchliche Einheit—Selby Vernon McCasland, Ph.D 282
United Church of Northern India is Shy of Episcopacy, The—The United Church Review 359
United Church Review, The. The United Church of Northern India is Shy of Episcopacy 359

PAGE
United Lutheran Church in America as an Intra-Denominational Movement in Church Reunion—Rev. Abdel Ross, Wentz, Ph.D., D.D. 50
Union of Scotch Presbyterians—The Quarterly Register 190

Way, The—Chauncey R. Piety 67
Wentz, Ph.D., D.D., Rev Abdel Ross. United Lutheran Church in America as an Intra-Denominational Movement in Church Union 50
Wesley, John, Among the Scientists. Clarence R. Athearn 375
What People and Papers are Saying about Unity 86, 168, 234, 345
What is a Valid Ministry for a United Church?—Alfred C. Garrett, Ph.D. 149
Which is Blind? The Alley Or—?—Rt. Rev. Edward L. Parsons, D.D. 315
Why I Consider the Protestant Episcopal Church One of the Protestant Group—Rev. Carl Eckhardt Grammer, S. T. D. 310
Who Will Build the World Anew?—Thomas Curtis Clark 25
Whitaker, Robert. The Living Blend 314
Wilmer, D.D., Rev. C. B. "The Scandal of Christianity" 109
Williams, Michael. "The Scandal of Christianity" 106
Will to Unity, The—Rev. S. M. Zwemer, D.D. 223
World Laughs Out Loud, The—The New York Journal 267

Zwemer, D.D., Rev. S. M. The Will to Unity 223
Zurcher, Rev. George. Clearing up Misunderstandings 88

BOOKS REVIEWED

Bible Through the Centuries, The—Willett 285
Book of Common Prayer, The, 1929 378
Case of Episcopacy, The—Mackenzie 376
China Christian Year Book, 1929 377
Christian Reunion in Ecumenical Light—Hall 376
Church Union in South India—Waller 376
Dilemma of Protestantism, The—Hammond 95
Essentials and Non-Essentials of the Christian Faith—Shaw 374
If I Could Preach Just Once 92
In Memoriam:—Charles Henry Brent 191
Leaves from the Note Book of a Tamed Cynic—Niebuhr 378
Letters of Peter Plymley to his Brother Abraham Who Lives in the Country—Smith 191
Master's Memorial, The—Blair 192
Master, The—Bowie 96
Protestantism in the United States—Bass 94
Religion, Whence and Whither—Macon 378
Religion in Soviet Russia—Emhardt 192
Reunion of Christianity, The—Marchant 203
Science and the Unseen World—Eddington 377
Social Sources of Denominationalism, The—Niebuhr 287
Training for World Friendship—Brown 191
Um Kirchliche Einheit—Pribilla 282
What Happened in Palestine?—Samuel 288
What is Christian Education?—Coe 373

A New Book from the Press of
Willett, Clark & Colby, Chicago

"The Scandal of Christianity"

By

PETER AINSLIE

Contents

I. The Blight of Denominationalism.
II. Denominationalism at a Discount in the Eyes of an Intelligent World.
III. The Awkwardness of Denominationalism in the Face of Equality of Christians before God.
IV. There is No Alternative: Church History Must Be Rewritten.
V. The Hurt to Christianity Through Denominational "Voices" — the Denominational School and the Denominational Paper.
VI. Can the World be Christianized by a Denominational Christianity?
VII. What is the Hope for the Cure of the Scandal?

This book has been in the hands of reviewers for the last eight months. Many have given lengthy reviews, some editorial reviews. It has been commended and attacked. *The Survey* says: "It is a blazing, blistering excoriation of the whole denominational system. The whole system is utterly and pathetically inadequate to meet the needs of to-day." The *Times-Union*, Albany, N. Y., says: "It is frank, honest and unusually readable."

Pages 212 ***Price $2.00***

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY
230 N. FULTON AVENUE
BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

PRINTED IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Equality of all Christians Before God

Edited by Charles Clayton Morrison,
Editor *The Christian Century*, Chicago

This is a full report, under the editorship of one of the most brilliant and courageous pens in American journalism, of the New York Conference of the Christian Unity League, held at St George's Protestant Episcopal church, Nov. 13-15, 1929.

This Conference marked the turning of a decisive corner in the advance toward a united church. Every one who is interested at all in Christian unity will want to read this volume. Every page abounds in interest.

Here is a part of the program: "Prayer as a Factor in the Unity of the Church," by Dr. Peter Ainslie, Baltimore. Greetings by Dr. Karl Reiland, rector of St. George's church. "The Need of a United Christendom," by Mr. Robert Fulton Cutting, vestryman of St. George's church. "What a United Church Can Do That a Divided Church Cannot Do," by Dr. W. Beatty Jennings, Philadelphia. "How Much Christian Unity Do We Now Have?" by Dr. Beverley D. Tucker, Jr., Richmond, Va. "Recent Evidences of Growth Toward Christian Unity," by Dr. J. W. Woodside, Ottawa, Canada. "The End of a Cycle in Protestantism," by Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison, Chicago. "A Survey of the Day's Thinking," by Dr. Robert Norwood, New York. "Possibilities of Attaining Christian Unity," by President Daniel L. Marsh, Boston. "What Would Be the Attitude of Jesus Toward a Divided Church?" by Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, New York. "Shall We Continue Our Emphases on Orthodoxy and Conformity Rather Than on Purposes and Objectives?" by President George W. Richards, Lancaster, Pa. "Our obligation to the Future to Hasten a United Christendom," by Dr. W. H. P. Fauce, Providence, R. I. "The Call of the Future for a United Church," by Mr. Stanley High, Editor *The Christian Herald*, New York. Discussion follows each of these addresses.

The dramatic moving of the Lord's supper from St. George's church to the chapel of Union Theological Seminary, with Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin as celebrant, assisted by Dr. Karl Reiland, Dr. Robert Norwood, and Dr. Wallace MacMullen, was one of the significant events that indicates we have come to the time when brotherhood has priority over conformity to ecclesiastical practices.

This is one of the great books of the year.

Price $2.00

Address

THE CHRISTIAN UNITY LEAGUE
230 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md.

CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY
1929-1930

DATE	ISSUED TO

DEMCO